

Property of
Graduate Theological Union

APR 19 1986

LEVEL
ONE

Christian Order

Summary of Contents for March, 1986

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| THE EXTRAORDINARY SYNOD | <i>Father Bryan Houghton</i> |
| A QUESTION OF DECULTURATION | <i>The Editor</i> |
| OLD GREY-HAIRED ERRORS :
THE NEW THEOLOGY | <i>Father Thomas O'Mahony</i> |
| A SERMON ON POWER | <i>Lucia S. Shen</i> |
| A CATHOLIC DEBT TO MARXISM ? : 2 | <i>B. A. Santamaria</i> |
| REPORT ON TWO REPORTS : 2 | <i>The Editor</i> |
| THE EXTRAORDINARY SYNOD
1 : EPISCOPAL OUTLOOK ON THE EVE | <i>Philip Trower</i> |

PILGRIMAGE HOLIDAY

to

SEEFELD IN AUSTRIA

Depart Saturday, August 9th from London by Coach.
Eight Days; no night travel; £235. Excursions (included)
to Innsbruck, Salzburg, Italian Dolomites, Oberammergau.

Details from : **Father Michael Clifton, 30 Park Road,
Colliers Wood, London SW19 2HS. Phone 540-3057.**

**CORPUS CHRISTI CHURCH,
MAIDEN LANE, STRAND,
LONDON, W.C.2.**

EVERY MONDAY

TRIDENTINE MASS AT 5.45 P.M.

Preceded by

ROSARY & BENEDICTION AT 5.15 P.M.

Cum Permissu Superiorum

Contents

Page

- 130 A QUESTION OF
DECULTURATION *The Editor*
- 132 THE EXTRAORDINARY
SYNOD *Fr. Bryan Houghton*
- 137 REPORT ON
TWO REPORTS: 1 *The Editor*
- 146 A SERMON ON POWER
Lucia S. Shen
- 153 THE EXTRAORDINARY
SYNOD: 1
EPISCOPAL OUTLOOK ON
THE EVE *Philip Trower*
- 174 OLD GREY-HAIRED ERRORS:
THE NEW THEOLOGY
Fr. Thomas O'Mahony
- 180 A CATHOLIC DEBT TO
MARXISM?: 2 *B. A. Santamaria*

If You Change Your Address :

Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order is a magazine devoted to Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields. It is published ten times a year.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London S.W.1V, 2BG. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £5 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$10.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows :

U.S.A., Canada

India, etc.—£10, \$20

Australia—£12, \$25

New Zealand—£12, \$25

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 27

MARCH

NO. 3

A Question of Deculturation

THE EDITOR

WE have had the Indult of October, 1984 which, it is clear, Pope John Paul II caused to be published and promulgated, in the face of internal opposition from certain personages within the Roman Curia, out of genuine pastoral concern for those of the Faithful who have had to suffer so much by reason of the banishment of the Old Mass.

Its restricted restoration was hardly greeted with joy by the Bishops of the Church; neither were they generous in the use of the powers accorded them by the Indult. On the contrary, many of them hastened to affix, in one way or another, further restrictions to those already slipped round the Indult by unfriendly characters within the Roman Curia. All this we know and, if I may say so, tend to hold those responsible for these varied performances in something close to contempt, not only because of the methods they employed and the near-total insensitivity that attended them; but because, acting as they did, they went contrary to the pastoral concern which most clearly and primarily motivated Pope John Paul II when he promulgated the Indult. Thereby, they went contrary to Canon Law which lays it down that, in what you might call the peripheral round of such an Indult, the pastoral concern of the Supreme Pastor should take pride of place in the minds of those whose duty it is to execute its terms. (On this, see "The Indult: a Commentary" by the distinguished Canon Lawyer, Count Nerei Capponi in *Christian Order* for

August-September, 1985). Sadly, one has to say that, in this matter of the Indult of October, 1985, 1984, too many of the Faithful were treated by their supposed Pastors as little more than errant school-children. Such conduct, I have to say with sadness, was not merely unworthy. It was disgraceful.

A further point, not always realised. Much is talked these days of inculturation, which Cardinal Ratzinger, the Synod Bishops in their *Report*, Pope John Paul and, indeed, the Second Vatican Council made much of; and, indeed, rightly so. Given due safeguards, that the inculturation process must never result in the loss of that supernatural reality which is the Church itself, who would be against it? But when the loss of the Church's essential self appears as on the verge of occurring — which I am told is the reality in areas of India today — then the time has long since passed when episcopal authority should have called a halt. For the rest, I am not opposed to inculturation, given the appropriate safeguards that any sane individual would weave round the process. Pluriformity, within that communion in Christ, which is the Church, should serve only to reveal its magnificence, which means that its executors should only be those who themselves truly live and recognize, with the faith that is theirs, the supernatural reality of the Church as Christ's Mystical Body.

This said, let me ask a simple question in this matter of the Tridentine Mass. It is simply this. Why is it that the Tridentine Mass, which was integral to the culture not only of Western Europe; but of North America, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, no doubt also of South America (in the case of this continent, I speak as one less wise); why is it that, via the Old Mass, the Church which is so enthusiastic now with regard to inculturation in vast areas of the world, should be pursuing — with disastrous effects — a process of deculturation in Western Europe and those countries which share its magnificent cultural heritage; stripping that heritage of its very core as, with relentless and reckless insensitivity, episcopal authority strives by any and every means to stamp out the old Mass.

Why so, my Lords; why are you doing this? I leave the matter there and ask your Lordships to be kind enough to reflect on it.

Father Bryan Houghton sums up his own reflections on the Synod at the end of last year (1985). He sees two dangers, but is thankful for pronounced and positive gains.

The Extraordinary Synod

NOV. 24th to DEC. 8th, 1985

FR. BRYAN HOUGHTON

THE rules governing Synods were promulgated by Paul VI on December 8th, 1966. Among them was this : "all those taking part in a Synod are bound to secrecy as regards both its preparatory documents and the sessions themselves." However, in August, 1985 both the English and Canadian hierarchies published their reports or "preparatory documents" for the forthcoming Synod. In France some individual bishops, such as those of Evreux and Poitiers, aired their personal views, but the report submitted to the Synod was not divulged. All honour to the French hierarchy, which must have been under considerable pressure to follow the Anglo-Canadian example and help to spike the Synod before it started.

The Anglo-Canadian initiative failed to cause as much mischief as expected partly because our anti-Pope, Professor Hans Küng, published an encyclical in *The New York Times*, Toronto's *Globe and Mail* and Montreal's *Le Devoir*. It was reproduced *in extenso* by way of warning in the excellent French weekly *L'Homme Nouveau* for November 3rd. I hope it saw light in England. Anyway, Küng called on bishops to go into direct schism from Rome if there was the slightest hesitation at the Synod to check the headlong rush of Progress. This was enough to make even the least thoughtful bishop think. For years the bishops had been hounding Mgr. Lefebvre as a schismatic and here was Küng expecting them to join him. No, schism must be avoided at all costs, even if it implies a slackening

in the speed of Progress. This explains in part the apparent docility of some of the most dubious bishops at the Synod. It is a curious situation : if the Pope is terrified of inducing a schism, so are the bishops in creating one. Perhaps one can paraphrase : "The fear of schism is the beginning of wisdom."

After this preamble, let us turn to the Extraordinary Synod itself. *Extraordinary* it certainly was. How that? Well, there were present in the Vatican about 170 Prelates and over 500 journalists. In fact, there were three media-men per bishop.

Turn your mind back to Vatican II. The rather massive array of 3000 conciliar Fathers was at the mercy of the same 500 press-men. Although the ratio of press-men to bishops was only one to six, "the Spirit of Vatican II" was in fact the mass-media. With the reversed proportion of three to one, the media could expect a field-day.

But things did not work out like that at all. The 500 media-men were fed exclusively on official hand-outs—and they do not appear to have got hold of many tit-bits. Even the Anglo-Canadian bishops seem to have remained reasonably silent. It must be an unique phenomenon in this second half of the 20th century. Anyway, it restores my confidence in the hierarchy, which had been at a low ebb. We may complain that some bishops tend to be lazy, touchy and ill-informed; but we now have proof that they are capable of being honourable, which is all we ask of them.

At the Synod the first session on November 21st was opened by a short speech by Cardinal Garonne. It was an admirable choice. I know something, rather tenuously, about him, because he gave me a couple of teeth from the relics of St. Edmund at St. Sernin, Toulouse, when I was Parish Priest of Bury St. Edmunds. Perhaps I am prejudiced in his favour. Nonetheless, I think he was the perfect hyphen between Vatican II and Twenty Years After. As Archbishop of Toulouse he had sat through the Council. He was open to new ideas for the simple reason that he is an intellectual, to whom ideas are far more real than realities. He was also President of the rather shady Tribunal which condemned Mgr. Lefebvre. No progressive could possibly deny his pedigree. Yes, but he is a Roman Catholic. I can

think of no personality more capable of bridging the twenty years gulf than he.

The Synod then got down to business. The Summary of the National Reports had been drawn up and was delivered by Cardinal Daneels. Unlike Garonne, he is a new man, successor of retired Cardinal Suenens as Archbishop of Malines-Brussels. Again, an excellent choice : he preserves the progressive halo of his predecessor although tinted with Ratzingerism (a form of 'racialism' to the Progressives) since he accompanied the Prefect of the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith on his tour in France, when Ratzinger attempted to persuade the French hierarchy to include a minimum of dogma in their catechism. The Garonne-Daneels combination seems to me genial.

Daneels' Summary is not only interesting but positively important. It provides a profit and loss account for the Church over the last twenty years under eight headings. This in itself is extraordinary. We have had it dinned into us that every post-Conciliar reform has been inspired by the Holy Ghost, and has been an incalculable gain. To suggest that there might be a loss was considered disloyal and divisive. Well, from now onwards we are at liberty to maintain that there has been a loss. Moreover, the avowed losses are very much what ordinary Catholics had diagnosed twenty years ago. Far from being myopic Traditionalists, we turn out to be far-sighted Progressives !

It would take too long to analyse all eight headings. I shall take the three most important by way of example.

1. Liturgy and the Sacraments

- a. gain : participation—greater knowledge of Holy Writ.
- b. loss : "exteriorism" (play-acting ?) — personal fads — "The crisis in the Sacrament of Penance is to be deplored, as is the lack of appreciation of the notions of adoration and sacrifice".

Now, this last admission, "the lack of appreciation of the notions of adoration and sacrifice", is quite fundamental. I fail to see how a reform of the *Novus Ordo* can be long delayed. It looks as though the Ministry of the Word up to the Creed will remain much as it is now, albeit with more rubrics. But from the Creed onwards the Mass will revert to the adoration and sacrificial Offertory, Canon and

Communion as of yore. It would follow the suggestion I made some nine years ago in *Mitre & Crook*; which, incidentally, is to be reprinted next month in the U.S.A.

2. The Word of God and the Teaching of the Church

- a. gain : consciousness of the Bible leading to a spiritual and catechetical renewal.
- b. loss : "The importance given to the Bible has sometimes isolated it from its vital context which is the living tradition of the Church. Do modern catechisms form a whole ? Are they complete and properly structured. As far as teaching is concerned, a most important area concerns morals, particularly sex. The Church's doctrine is shrouded in embarrassed silence . . . There is a real danger of subjective christianity in which everyone would have the right to do what they want".

This is very firm stuff. It follows that a Roman Catechism will have to succeed the permissive Dutch Catechism, at present universally in use. Indeed, later during the Synod, it was agreed that a catechism of Vatican II should be issued in much the same way, presumably, as was issued the Catechism of the Council of Trent. This is of vast and positive importance. It is clear that only Rome has the authority to draw up such a catechism; that all local catechisms will have to conform with it; as will the syllabi of the seminaries, teachers' Training Colleges and the rest.

3. The Notion of the Church

- a. gain : lay responsibility—committed basic groups.
- b. loss : "The notion of the Church is the kernel of the crisis. The idea of the Church as 'the People of God' has been taken ideologically. Totally false oppositions have emerged between the 'Institutional Church' and the 'Mystical Church'; between the 'Church as the People of God' and the 'Hierarchical Church'; between 'local churches' and the 'Church of Rome'. Suspicion has replaced confidence".

I agree whole-heartedly. But the problem still remains. It is easy enough to turn confidence into suspicion, but how does one reverse the process ? Cardinal Daneels has certainly helped by the mere fact of producing a profit and

loss account. Words, however, are never quite enough to restore confidence : the odd action is also required.

Surely all this is unexpectedly good ?

Of course it is far too early to use Cardinal Daneels' technique and draw up a profit and loss account of the Synod. At the time of writing (Dec. 11th, '85) everything appears to be profit : strengthening of the authority of the Holy See; admission of the inadequacy of the *Novus Ordo*; an universal catechism of Vatican II; precision on the definition of the Church as "The People of God" as opposed to "The Mystical Body of Christ" (this is the crux); an explanation of 'religious liberty' (which is *not* crucial in spite of what traditionalists may say); a revised Code for the Eastern Churches. All this is immensely good, important and positive. It has required the frustration of 500 disgruntled journalists to make it appear insignificant.

However, if I can see no loss I can see two dangers.

Firstly, it is fairly natural for the bishops to be loyal to the Holy See when they are under the physical eye of the Holy Father. But what will they be like when they are under the more exacting eyes of their own Commissions and the local Press ? Obviously, I have due veneration for the Successors of the Apostles but I also remember that all but one of the original twelve ran away at the Crucial Moment.

Secondly, I learn from the final document of the Synod that a special committee is to be set up "to examine the principle of 'subsidiarity' " (i.e. the prohibition of a superior from interfering in matters which fall within the competence of an inferior). This is a recognised rule in civil societies (recognized by its constant infractions!) But can it be applied to the Catholic Church ?

Now, "subsidiarity" is precisely the point raised by the English hierarchy in its *illicit* publication of its pre-synodal report. In principle, I do not agree that illicit documents should receive legal consideration. Moreover, if the Pope is to resign his jurisdiction as being the "Universal Ordinary" (i.e. having jurisdiction over every particular diocese), then he had better resign and go back to Cracow. "Appeal to Rome" is the only safeguard of clergy and laity alike against the dictatorship of local bishops.

Father Crane publishes this month and next his comments on the *Ratzinger Report* set over and against that published by the participating Bishops at the close of the Extraordinary Synod and with the authority of the Pope.

CURRENT COMMENT

Report on Two Reports : I

THE EDITOR

IN an Editorial in *The Tablet* (14/12/85) entitled "Seeking a New Balance", the Editor of this Weekly, described by Graham Greene as "the most liberal Catholic paper in existence", spoke of Cardinal Ratzinger's "remarkable interview" with the Italian journalist, Vittorio Messori, in which he spoke of the need for a "restoration" within the Catholic Church. The Cardinal spoke of this need after pointing out in his interview that, during the twenty years since Vatican II, "every kind of heretical deviation" had been beating close "at the door of authentic faith". Hence the need for a restoration.

Cardinal Ratzinger and "Restoration"

The word "restoration" was seized on by the Press — Catholic and otherwise — and by progressive circles within the Church itself, as well as those who might be described as hard-core traditionalists, as signifying a restoration of Church discipline and practice to the point that had been reached on the eve of Vatican II. It is reasonably safe to say that nothing could be further from the truth than that. The Ratzinger press interview was later translated excellently into English and converted into book-form by the Ignatius Press in San Francisco. It was published subsequently in this country as *The Ratzinger Report* on Nov-

ember 28th, 1975 at £7.95 by Fowler Wright (Leominster, Herefordshire).

I studied *The Ratzinger Report* with extreme care before applying myself with like attention to the Report by the participating Bishops that was published in the immediate aftermath of the Extraordinary Synod with the approval of the Holy Father. The Report was published in *The Tablet* on the date mentioned above under the title of "The Church in the World"; later as a CTS pamphlet at 45p and titled *Synod Report*. My references throughout this and a subsequent article next month are to the *Tablet* version.

Had the writer of the *Tablet* Editorial had—or made—the opportunity of studying Cardinal Ratzinger's *Report* before putting pen to paper, he would not, I think, have spoken, as he did, of the Ratzinger press interview as a "trial balloon" that was "shot down" in the course of the Extraordinary Synod. The implication here would appear to be that, where the Editor of the *Tablet*, along with the Catholic Press in general, was concerned, to say nothing of the national and international secular Press, TV and media generally, "restoration" for Cardinal Ratzinger meant what it appeared to mean at the time; i.e. a return to the particularized Church discipline and practice of the past. Hence, when this did not occur, the Extraordinary Synod was regarded generally as a "flop", a "non-event" at the best; at the worst (according to which "side" you were on, progressive or traditionalist) as a victory or defeat.

It was, in fact, neither, for the simple reason that "restoration" was never intended by Cardinal Ratzinger in the sense in which it was taken by the Media before the Extraordinary Synod took place. By way of evidence, let us turn to the Cardinal's explanation in his own words as given to Vittorio Messori on page 37 of his *Report*:

"If by 'restoration' is meant a turning back, no restoration of such kind is possible. The Church, moves forward toward the consummation of history, she looks ahead to the Lord who is coming. No, there is no going back, nor is it possible to go back. Hence there is no 'restoration' whatsoever in this sense. But if by 'restoration' we understand the search for a new balance after all the exaggerations of an indiscriminate opening to the

world, after the overly positive interpretations of an agnostic and atheistic world, well, then a 'restoration' understood in this sense (a newly found balance of orientations and values within the Catholic totality) is altogether desirable and, for that matter, is already in operation in the Church. In this sense it can be said that the first phase after Vatican II has come to a close".

This is clear enough. No trial balloon of the Cardinal's was shot down at the Extraordinary Synod. What was shot down was a toy balloon of the Media's making; the blasting, if you like, of a never-was. Meanwhile, it is very fair to say that a careful reading of the Bishop's *Report* on the Extraordinary Synod reveals the Ratzinger scale of values, which are only and indeed those of the Church, as running strongly through its course. Seen in this light, the Extraordinary Synod — far from being a wash-out from the narrowly traditionalist point of view — shows the Church as in process already of recovering those values of which priests and faithful must repossess themselves; if the Church, through them, is to be faithful to the Council's basic aim of showing the face of Christ more clearly than ever to the contemporary world. What is required, then, is *depth*, as distinct from any tinkering with external structures; the Church as the *supernatural* reality that it is — the body of those who share life in Christ, as distinct from a merely human collective; something in no way essentially of the world, but in it; of itself far greater than the sum-total of its members precisely because a divine and not a human reality, the Mystical Body of Christ, the communion of those whose membership of the Church is on an altogether different — because supernatural — plane from that which links the members of a desupernaturalized (meaning, here, human) community.

For too Many Progressives, the Church is Man-Made

The trouble now is that, in the eyes of too many, this is just what the Church has become; no more than a secular, man-made construct (the influence of Karl Rahner and Teilhard de Chardin is clear here), devoid to a greater or lesser extent of permanent supernatural content (because in

evolutionary process of *becoming*, which relativises truth) which, at the least, is rated by its members as of little significance, at the worst, of none; capable, therefore, as little more than a human collective, of *being altered at will to suit the wishes of its secularised members*, irrespective of the claims laid on them by reason of the true *supernatural* nature of the Church, Christ's Mystical Body, the Incarnation of Himself in the world. Of this tremendous reality, adherents of the make-believe Church of Schillebeex, Rahner, Teilhard de Chardin and Kueng have long since lost sight. Within this context, Cardinal Ratzinger writes in his *Report*:

"For a Catholic the Church is indeed composed of men who organise her external visage. But behind this, the fundamental structures are willed by God Himself, and therefore they are inviolable. Behind the human *exterior* stands the mystery of a *more than human* reality, in which reformers, sociologists, organizers have no authority whatsoever. If the Church, instead, is viewed as a human construction, the production of our own efforts, even the contents of the faith end up assuming an arbitrary character: the faith, in fact, no longer has an authentic, guaranteed instrument through which to express itself. Thus, without a view of the mystery of the Church that is also *supernatural* and not only *sociological*, christology itself loses its reference to the divine in favour of a purely human structure, and ultimately it amounts to a purely human project; the Gospel becomes the *Jesus-project*, the social-liberation project or other merely historical, immanent projects that can still seem religious in appearance, but which are atheistic in substance". (*Report*, p. 46).

Mystical Body of Christ or People of God

In an immediately following and very powerful passage, he sets what I have just been quoting over and against the prevailing prejudice that speaks almost exclusively of Catholics not as members of the Mystical Body of Christ, but as the People of God. The quotation is long but necessary. Here it is:

"'People of God' in Scripture, in fact, is a reference to Israel in its relationship of prayer and fidelity to the

Lord. But to limit the definition of the Church to that expression means not to give expression to the New Testament understanding of the Church in its fullness. Here 'People of God' actually refers always to the Old Testament element of the Church, to her continuity with Israel. But the Church receives her New Testament character more distinctively in the concept of the 'Body of Christ'. One is Church and one is a member thereof, not through a sociological adherence, but precisely through incorporation in this Body of the Lord through Baptism and the Eucharist. Behind the concept of the Church as the People of God, which has been so exclusively thrust into the foreground today, hide influences of ecclesiologies which de facto revert to the Old Testament; and perhaps also political, partisan and collective influences. In reality, there is no truly New Testament, Catholic concept of Church without a direct and vital relation not only with sociology but first of all with christology. The Church does not exhaust herself in the 'collective' of believers; being the 'Body of Christ' she is much more than the simple sum of her members". (*Report*, p. 47).

The Church Belongs to its Founder, not its Members

The continued employment of the kind of terminology to which the Cardinal refers could lead, quite obviously, even at the hands of well-intentioned but misled Catholics (of whom there are so many) to a concept of the Church as *the property of the people who belong to the community of believers*; who constitute what is in process of becoming in fact a man-made, secularized Church. Precisely because it is basically secularist at heart, the type of collective to which we make reference here is poles apart from that supernatural communion of Christians in Christ, which makes up His Mystical Body, which is the Church that Christ Our Lord and God founded; the Incarnation of Himself in the world, with the task of extending through time the work of Christ's Redemption; which is to bring to the men of every age the means of salvation. The Church thus rightly conceived does *not* belong to its mem-

bers; but to its Founder, Our Lord Jesus Christ. Correctly so conceived, it is not for the members of Christ's Mystical Body to do with it as they please. They are tied by its essentially *supernatural* nature to give priority in all they do to its *supernatural* purpose, which is the salvation of souls. All else that the Church does must be seen as ancillary to that purpose; *never* as a substitute for it. Of such a substitution, those who view the Church as no more than a human construct have, since the Council, been many times guilty.

Religious in Appearance: Atheistic in Substance

It is important to notice, in the context of what has been said above, that the growing notion of the Church as little more than a human construct divorced from or largely in disregard of its essentially divine and supernatural reality, owing all to the man-made efforts of its members, is found largely in the network of groups and/or basic communities, which criss-crosses its way within and throughout the Catholic Church today. On the South American Continent and particularly, perhaps, throughout Brazil, the group-network constituted within the boundaries of that country has just about reached the point where its members consider themselves as belonging to a popular or People's Church constituted by themselves and from which each draws life in the shape of a strengthening of human vitality from group-experience and companionship; for whom — in fact and indeed — the group is both a kind of bastard sacrament and source of moral and doctrinal authority. In other words, no matter how good their intentions and how great the neglect that may have been theirs at the hands of the clerical representatives of Christ's true Church, they themselves are outside it. As such, in the words of Cardinal Ratzinger already quoted, "they can still seem religious in appearance, but . . . are atheistic in substance". The same would seem to apply to the Renew groups, which have sprouted, under the aegis of Archbishop Geraty of Newark, New Jersey, USA, across the United States and well into Canada and the Caribbean; and which are now in process of plantation in New Zealand, Australia, the United Kingdom as well as elsewhere, for all I know. For these, as

always, "Church" is the group, which also serves its members as bastard sacrament; source of its life, that is, and inspiration of its ultimately power-seeking activity.

The Catholic Church not Democratic

There can be no doubt whatsoever but that this concept of the Church as little more than a human construction, created and owned by its members and which can be freely reorganized by them according to the requirements and mood of the moment, has the gravest consequences for the twin concepts of hierarchy and authority within the Church itself and for Divine Truth as received and never made by men. The Church, by reason of its divine essence, is not democratic (a fact which a good many bishops have yet to realise); as such she is necessarily an affront to a secularised and democratic (a la Rousseau world). So what? Let the Church stand its ground without a particle of shame for what it is; the reality of Christ in the world. As such, certain to be hated by the world, as Christ Himself was and said His Church would be. Why should we Catholics be frightened, still less ashamed of that? A great deal of the trouble that has overtaken the Church during the last 20 years would appear to flow from the fact that very many of the Church's episcopal representatives have feared the shame that would come to them from a secularized world if they stood strong and straight for that which is true because divine. In consequence, they have failed to resist error. Instead, most shamefully, they have buckled before it. As Saint John Fisher said some four hundred years ago of his fellow bishops not long before his own execution: "The fort is betrayed even of those that should have defended it". They left him alone to die, as their spiritual successors today have left so many of us alone to "die" totally without support. I say no more. Let God be their judge not men. Meanwhile, one thing is certain. Let them take notice of this: we shall never cease resisting the efforts of those who would strip us and our children of the Faith for which our Fathers suffered and died. *Never*; let us turn now to the question of authority within the Church. It is wrapped up, obviously, with the subject we have just been discussing; which is the nature of the Church itself. Let

Cardinal Ratzinger do the summing up here. He writes as follows:

"Here lies the origin of the decline of the authoritarian concept of obedience. According to some it would no longer even be a Christian virtue but a heritage of an authoritarian, dogmatic past, hence one to be overcome. If the Church, in fact, is *our Church*, if *we alone* are the Church, if her structures are not willed by Christ, then it is no longer possible to conceive of the existence of a hierarchy as a service to the baptized established by the Lord himself. It is the rejection of the concept of an authority willed by God, an authority that has its legitimation in God and not—as happens in political structures — in the consensus of the members of the majority of the organization. But the Church of Christ is not a party, not an association, not a club. Her deep and permanent structure is not *democratic* but *sacramental*, consequently *hierarchical*. For the hierarchy based on the apostolic succession is the indispensable condition to arrive at the strength, the reality of the sacrament. Here authority is not based on the majority of votes, it is based on the authority of Christ himself, which he willed to pass on to men who were to be his representatives until his definitive return. Only if this perspective is acquired anew will it be possible to rediscover the necessity and fruitfulness of obedience to the legitimate ecclesiastical hierarchies".

Let US Begin with Ourselves

The Cardinal then proceeds to show in his *Report* and most strikingly that, where reform is concerned, the *fidelity* of the Bride of Christ, which is the Church, can never be in question; by contrast that of its members can. From which it follows that reform or renewal or whatever you care to call it, must start *within each one of us*. What then is to be done? Here is the Cardinal's answer, generalized of necessity in this context, but true:

"We must always bear in mind that the Church is not ours but his (i.e. Christ's). Hence the 'reform', the 'renewals' — necessary as they may be — cannot exhaust themselves in a zealous activity on our part to erect new, sophisticated structures. The most that can

come from a work of this kind is a Church that is 'ours', to our measure, which might indeed be interesting but which, by itself, is nevertheless not the true Church, that which sustains us with the faith and gives us life with the sacrament. I mean to say that what we can do is infinitely inferior to him who does. Hence, true 'reform' does not mean to take great pains to erect new facades (contrary to what certain ecclesiologists think). Real 'reform' is to strive to let what is ours disappear as much as possible so what belongs to Christ may become more visible. It is a truth well known to the saints. Saints, in fact, reformed the Church in depth, not by working up plans for new structures, but by reforming themselves. What the Church needs in order to respond to the needs of man in every age is holiness, not management". (*Report*, p. 53).

How about that, you clerical planners? How about that, you bureaucrats? How about that? Begin with yourselves? "Come follow me", He said. Who is it to be then, Himself or someone like Hans Kueng or Gregory Baum?

I have devoted far more space in this article to Cardinal Ratzinger's Report than that of the Synod Fathers; if only for the fact that, contrary to what was supposed and beefed about so superficially by the Media, Catholic and Secular, the Extraordinary Synod was not a defeat for anyone, least of all Cardinal Ratzinger and the Pope. If, as I implore you to do, you read the Synod Report with care, you will find, by way of strong, if unobtrusive, undertone, the mark of the Cardinal upon it. It is this that gives me great heart. The tide is beginning now to flow our way. Reality is emerging now after twenty years of fantasy dominated by the mirage known as "the spirit of Vatican II". What emerges from the Bishops Report on the Synod — especially if you study Ratzinger's fine work alongside it — is the blessed realization that the Church is beginning now to find her feet again. There is still a long way to go, much suffering to ensue and endure for all of us. But the Church, as I see it, in the light of these two Reports, is again on her way. A succeeding article will endeavour to cover other vital points in Cardinal Ratzinger's *Report*. Meanwhile, do get it and study if you possibly can.

The collected works of a German Jesuit writer, Fr. Alfred Delp, have just been published. He was hanged in 1945 on Hitler's orders, although innocent of the conspiracy against Hitler with which he had been charged.

In the following pages, Lucia Shen, an American writer, gives some details of Fr. Delp's career and her translation of a sermon he preached on the feast of St. Elizabeth of Hungary, November 17. Acknowledgements to *Social Survey*.

A Sermon on Power

LUCIA S. SHEN

CANDLEMAS DAY 1945 fell on a First Friday, a "Heart-of-Jesus Friday", as it is called in Germany. In his cell in Berlin's Plotzensee Prison, a Jesuit priest, 37 years old, sat absorbed in prayer. Perhaps for a moment his thoughts turned to those Jesuits who would make their final vows that day, vows that he himself had made in prison, secretly and with bound hands, only two months earlier. The cell door opened, and with a smile for a prison chaplain who was his friend—"In half an hour, I'll know more than you do!"—Alfred Delp, S.J., was led away to be hanged for high treason against the Third Reich.

Why did the Nazis have Fr. Delp put to death? Several decisions on his part led to this event and illuminate it. The eldest child of a family in which the father was Lutheran and the mother Catholic, Alfred Delp was brought up in his father's church, but at 14 he asked to be confirmed as a Catholic. He joined the Society of Jesus five years later. Even at this point, he was passionately convinced that the Church must find new ways to deal with the spiritual crises of modern times. His early works—for example, three one-act plays, *The Eternal Advent*, 1933, and studies in existentialist philosophy, including a respected treatise on Heidegger, 1935—explored the sense of emptiness and longing that haunted European civilization.

Truly Human Life

In 1939, after ordination, Fr. Delp was assigned to the editorial staff of the Jesuit journal of commentary *Stimmen der Zeit*. Despite the many pastoral duties he had also undertaken and the difficulties posed by Nazi censorship, he wrote prolifically. (His collected works, edited by Roman Bleistein, S.J., have recently been published in four volumes: *Gesammelte Schriften*, Frankfurt am Main, Verlag Josef Knecht, 1982 - 1984. A powerful sense of the sovereign majesty of God pervades these writings. Over and over, the same message appears: Christ, the judge of history, is the only ruler in whose service men can find the free and truly human life they long for; any other course means delusion and ultimate tragedy.

In 1941, when the Gestapo forced *Stimmen der Zeit* to cease publication, Fr. Delp was apparently under suspicion, for police agents regularly monitored the homilies he preached as the new pastor of Sankt-Georg Church in Bogenhausen, near Munich.

Services to Jews

During this period, his resistance activities intensified. He helped Jews find safety, accompanying them to the Swiss border when possible, and at every opportunity he urged others, especially priests, to speak out against the Nazis in the name of Christ. In 1942, a request from his provincial superior, Augustine Rosch, S.J., brought a last fateful decision: Fr. Delp became a member of the Kreisau Circle, a discussion group including Lutherans and Catholics, aristocrats and labor leaders, that met to plan how German society could be reconstructed according to Christian principles after the war. In spite of a serious illness during this time, Fr. Delp, quickly became one of the most active participants in the group. He also formed a close friendship with its founder, Count Helmuth von Moltke, a young Lutheran from Prussia. Neither of them foresaw the *via crucis* that they would soon have to walk together.

Immediately after the attempt on Hitler's life by a group of German officers on July 20, 1944, the members of the Kreisau Circle were arrested; since several of them were acquainted with the officers, they were charged with com-

plicity in the plot. The terrible months of imprisonment that followed seemed to transfigure Fr. Delp, bringing deeper humility, fearlessness and a glowing spirit of love. After each session of vicious torture that routinely accompanied questioning, he forced himself to kneel on the floor of his cell and pray for his tormentors before collapsing on the wooden planks that served as his bed.

Suffering and Solitude

This experience of constant solitude, suffering and prayer produced Delp's best-known work, the mystical *Prison Meditations*, scribbled on scraps of paper and smuggled out of the prison by friends. (Its English translation, published by Thomas Merton, is now unfortunately out of print.) At the trial in January 1945, the Nazi presecutors were unable to link the Kreisau Circle with the July 20 plot against Hitler, but its principle members were sentenced to death on general charges of treason.

The text of what follows is my translation of a homily that Fr. Delp wrote for the feast day, November 17, of St. Elizabeth of Hungary (1207-1231). St. Elizabeth is one of the best-loved saints of Germany, revered as a symbol of national honour and nobility. The wife of a German prince and mistress of Warburg Castle, where Martin Luther translated the New Testament into German, she devoted her short life to the service of the poor. The setting for Fr. Delp's words is a Mass in Sankt-Georg church, a little jewel of baroque architecture nestled in the Bavarian countryside. A pale November sun plays over the happy exuberance of paintings and gilded scrollwork; above the high altar, St. George on his horse does battle with a writhing dragon. The parishioners are quiet and attentive. Yet one cannot feel at ease, for seated in the back of the church is a man who has not come here to worship. He is the eyes and ears of the Fuhrer, and this is what he will hear.

THE SERMON ON ST. ELIZABETH

"Blessed are the merciful, for they shall receive mercy".

"This week we celebrate the feast day of a German woman, a German princess :St. Elizabeth. As few saints of our Church have been able to do, she has transcended all denominational boundaries to become part of the common heritage of German life. Songs, legends, folk tales and

poems have taken her as their subject; historical works have delved into her life. She represents an ideal for the German people, those Germans for whom sainthood still has a meaning and for those who can only see in her a great and noble lady. Our women and girls bear her name, and it is in her name that women today beg charitable gifts for those in poverty and need.

"God, the Lord, raises up saints from among a people, not so that they can appear for a while and then vanish and be forgotten; nor so that they can be admired as great historical figures, or even as souls who have won a place in heaven; but so that we may listen to them, so that we may perceive the message they constantly transmit to us. And so today, we will ask what message this German princess has for the German people in this hour.

True Meaning

"Here is the first message Elizabeth brings us : a message about the true meaning of rulership. Elizabeth was a princess. Generally speaking, our temptations tend to stem not so much from what we are not, as from what we are. The temptations of the unimportant and the weak usually lie not in aspirations to greatness, but rather in the danger of being suffocated by mediocrity and cowardice; and the temptations of the great and the mighty also involve power. Elizabeth gave power a threefold blessing and revealed a threefold meaning of rulership.

"This is the first blessing : She linked power with law. When Elizabeth came to Warburg, the castle that has played such a fateful role in the life of our country, forces held sway there as in all other regions of Germany; gathered round the lord of the castle were robber barons from the surrounding countryside who consumed and squandered what they had extorted from the people. And then history tells us of the quiet transformation that originated with this woman's heartbreak, like a fire started by a spark, how she refused dishes from the banquet table that she knew had been prepared from stolen food; how she profoundly changed her husband, so that he was able to overcome force with law and came to understand that as the wielder of highest power, he himself must serve the law and use force only to guarantee that law for his subjects. That was the

first realization that Elizabeth brought to the Warburg : Man needs laws that no prince and no strong man may encroach upon without sullyng his own power and indelibly staining his position, his dignity and his crown.

"The second blessing that Elizabeth imparted to power is this : She revealed that service is the very meaning of power. Because of her quiet influence, a new spirit pervaded her husband's chanceries and their official decrees. The land became profoundly healed, because its master, who held power and responsibility, understood this : Power is given, not so that men may lord it over others, but so that it may bring benefits and blessings to all.

A New World

"And St. Elizabeth gave yet another blessing to power : She placed the might of her lord and husband at the service of an even greater Lord, the King of kings from whom all true sovereignty takes its meaning and without whom power becomes an arrogant rebellion, a caricature, an empty charade. In the eyes of the world, it was this very act on Elizabeth's part that wrecked her life, for her husband, in his eagerness to serve the Lord, took the cross and died as a crusader.

"Outwardly, her good fortune died with her lord and husband. But within her, there burst open a whole new world, a great world blazing with the light of God, and in place of her former glory, there came an answer from heaven : Her true importance was, and always would be, that which makes every creature important—the privilege of worshipping and serving the honour and glory of God. When power no longer has behind it the splendour and brilliance of the ultimate sovereign, it is a drab thing, devoid of dignity and worth, and its reign extends only as far as the terror it inspires. The minute this kind of power can no longer sustain itself by physical compulsion, it is forgotten and abandoned. The true meaning of earthly rule: That was Elizabeth's first message to our people.

"This woman brought a second message to our people and our land : a message about the true meaning of love. Elizabeth was a wife and mother. She was not the kind of saint we have become accustomed to from paintings, altar statues and pious legends, a figure without blood, passion

or life. Hear her desperate cries when she learned of her husband's death: 'Dead! He is dead? Then for me, the whole world is dead!' This woman loved as deeply as anyone has ever loved, and with the death of her love, light and song went out of her life and the stars became dim. It was precisely in this consecrated love, so genuine, so human, that the great secret lay.

"What a change she brought to Wartburg! When she left it, driven out and forgotten, the countryside had enjoyed many years of peace and wellbeing. The starting-point of this change was the true, holy, quiet love of a wife and mother. If you think about it, you realize that the transformation of the world, what man will become, what he will do with his life, is brought about least of all by official programs and announcements and other great undertakings. It comes about in the quiet home of all life, the family. It comes whenever people understand that the true meaning of love is not the will to dominate, to exploit and to possess; but that it lies in service, generosity, sacrifice, willingness to change and a desire that others be blessed and brought close to God. When our countrymen have learned once more the lesson of the Wartburg, so that they can emerge from the quiet and solitude of their homes touched and renewed by true love, a love that sanctifies us and helps us find the way to heaven, then our land and our people will be blessed, and we will have the strength to face whatever lies ahead.

The Meaning of Life

"Today, we hear a third message spoken by this woman from the high towers of the Warburg: a message about the true meaning of human life. When Elizabeth stepped beyond the confines of court life and gathered around her all the sick and wretched folk of the countryside, saying and doing just the right thing for each one, showing loving-kindness and true compassion, it was more than an eccentric noblewoman's whim; it was a philosophy of life that was not just talked about, but lived. When under this woman's quiet influence, charity, help and protection were extended to all the inhabitants of her realm, it showed an understanding of worldly affairs and of human beings in which there was no inner contradiction. And when, in her name, so

many good works bore their fruit in the land and among the people, the underlying cause was that same knowledge of mankind.

"Those who gathered around Elizabeth were not men with ringing steps; they were not men with blazing eyes and ramrod posture; they were not men of high rank. No, they were the cripples, the chronically ill, the retarded, the poor and every kind of outcast from normal life and existence—from the highways and hedgerows, from the asylums—the lost and the helpless. This woman stood among them, giving a blessing to all.

Purpose

"Alas, what was the purpose of these stunted lives? Ordinarily, no one would find any joy in them. But whoever has eyes to see what the Lord God intends for mankind recognizes that even in the most despised and derelict of human beings there is something that we are obliged to revere, that we must aid, that we must guard and nurture: the face of the Lord God Himself, who said, "I have formed man in my own image and likeness". And who may take it upon himself to annihilate this image and likeness, formed by the intelligence, will and love of God? This quiet woman bears an urgent message for our land, for our people, for each of us: Everywhere, wherever we find ourselves, wherever we may be called upon to bear witness, we must protect life, we must guard human beings from everything that can crush them underfoot. Woe to those who inflict suffering! And woe to those who have destroyed a human life, who have desecrated an image of God, even when it was already breathing its last, even when it seemed to represent only a vestige of humanity.

"This is the threefold message of this quiet woman of our land. And nothing remains but to turn the threefold message into a threefold prayer: 'St. Elizabeth, woman of our German land, princess of a German realm, obtain for us the grace of a blessed and consecrated use of power! Obtain for us the art of true and unselfish love! And obtain for us the strength and reverence to see God's countenance, God's will and God's love in other people—to be greeted, cared for and protected, always and everywhere!'"

Philip Trower, the distinguished English Catholic Author and Journalist, was commissioned by *The Wanderer* (American Catholic Weekly) to cover the Extraordinary Synod for the two weeks of its duration in Rome at the end of 1985. Very kindly we have been permitted to publish Mr. Trower's Reports, which will appear in this and succeeding issues of *Christian Order*. I find them invaluable, particularly for the light they throw on contemporary problems within the Church.

The Extraordinary Synod

1: EPISCOPAL OUTLOOK ON THE EVE

PHILIP TROWER

NO one I think is any doubt about the importance of the "Extraordinary" meeting of the Synod of Bishops, which will run from Nov. 25th to Dec. 8th, even if it should not be seen as an isolated event, but rather as another move in the continuing campaign of the Holy Father and the bishops supporting him to contain Modernism and get the implementation of the Second Vatican Council onto the right track.

The suddenness of the Holy Father's announcement last Jan. 25th, and the shrieks of alarm from those against any serious attempt to correct the abuses and misinterpretations, indicate how seriously the former views the situation, and how gravely the latter feel themselves threatened. This is no routine survey of "work in hand", for which the 25th anniversary of its commencement would have been the conventional date.

Before looking more closely into the reasons behind the holding of the Synod, however, it seems a good idea to recall once again some facts about the new method of con-

sultation between the Successor of St. Peter, and the Successors of the other Apostles, which Paul VI established by the Constitution *Apostolica Sollicitudo* during the last session of the Council (Autumn, 1965) to give expression to the doctrine of collegiality — the teaching that all the Bishops, not just the Pope, are meant in some way to have a “concern and solicitude” for the good of the whole Church (1).

Schismatic Tendencies

Since the first Synod I covered, the Synod on the Family in 1980, a great blessing has descended on the Church in the form of the Canons devoted to the subject in the new Code of Canon Law (342-348), and I strongly recommend anyone who can to read them before the tide of misinformation about the proper relationship between Pope and Bishops rises still higher.

What the Synod is and is not had already been laid down in *Apostolica Sollicitudo*, but the document did not lay down details of the procedure to be followed. This made it easier for the schismatic tendencies in the Church during the stormy meetings of the 1960s and 1970s to try and turn the Synod into what it is not nor ever should be, a General Council in more or less permanent session dictating to the Pope.

Clearly, not all participants understood the logic of the facts. About the fundamentals of collegiality no half-way position is possible. Either the majority vote of the episcopal college can bind the head, in which case you have Episcopaliamism, or it cannot so bind him, in which case you have the Church as founded by our Lord. As to whether the Pope consults other bishops enough, anyone who follows events at all closely knows that the Holy See is constantly listening and taking advice. The complaints about its not doing so come from people who give it advice which no Pope can take.

Fortunately, since the advent of Pope John Paul II, a procedure in keeping with a proper understanding of collegiality and the Synod's consultative nature has been thrashed out. At the end of the discussions the Fathers issue a short message to the Church of a general kind and

send a list of proposals to the Holy Father, who makes them the basis for an encyclical or other document which he publishes a year or so later on whatever has been a particular Synod's theme. During the first five Synods, the anti-Papal party tried to establish the right of the bishops to issue a document of their own independently of the Pope, as though the College could exist apart from the Successor of St. Peter, and they were a rival authority like the English Parliament in its struggle with Charles I.

Two Kinds of Synods

Meanwhile the new Code of Canon Law has dotted the i's and crossed the t's of *Apostolica Sollicitudo*.

Here then is a summary of what the Code says and some quotes for those without a copy.

The Bishops in Synod "by their counsel, assist the Roman Pontiff in the defence and development of faith and morals and in the preservation and strengthening of ecclesiastical discipline. They also consider questions concerning the mission of the Church in the world" (342).

"It is not its (the Synod's) function to settle matters or to draw up decrees, unless the Roman Pontiff has given it deliberative power in certain cases; in this event it rests with the Roman Pontiff to ratify the decisions of the Synod" (343). The Synod is also directly under the authority of the Pope with whom alone it lies to "convene the Synod . . . determine the agenda . . . preside over it personally or through others . . . conclude, transfer, suspend or dissolve" it (344).

Meetings of the Synod are of two kinds; general and special. General meetings or assemblies deal with matters affecting the universal Church. Special Synods are for "matters directly affecting a determined region or regions". The members of a special Synod will be chosen "principally from those regions for which the Synod is convened" (345-346). There have been two special Synods so far; the Synod for the Dutch Church in January, 1980 to try and improve the situation in Holland, and the Synod for Ukrainian Catholics in March of the same year.

General meetings can be either Ordinary or Extraordinary. Recent practice has been for them to be called every

three years. There have so far been six, since the first in 1967. The last Ordinary Synod was the one on penance in 1983, and the next (on the laity) was to have been in 1986. Because of the Extraordinary Synod this year, it has been postponed until 1987. For Ordinary Synods each national hierarchy elects between one and four members, depending on the hierarchy's size. Membership also includes representatives of the Religious orders and a group of Bishops, Archbishops, Cardinals, and others appointed by the Holy Father.

Extraordinary meetings of the Synod are called for "dealing with matters which require speedy resolution".

This no doubt partly explains why the meeting this autumn will only last two weeks instead of the more usual four. The only previous Extraordinary Synod was the 1969 meeting summoned by Paul VI to deal with the crisis provoked by the widespread rejection by bishops as well as theologians of the teaching *Humanae Vitae*. Membership of Extraordinary Synods is limited to heads of episcopal conferences, with the Patriarchs and some Archbishops of the Eastern Rite churches, and again a group appointed by the Pope.

Continuity

The head of the U.S. episcopal conference this time is Bishop James Malone of Youngstown, who will be accompanied to Rome by Archbishop John L. May of St. Louis. But the Archbishop will not take part in the Synod meetings or discussion groups. He presumably is going as the U.S. representatives' adviser.

Other members of Bishop Malone's party will be Msgr. Daniel Hoyer, general secretary of the NCCB, Fr. Carl J. Peter, former dean of religious studies at Catholic University, Washington, D.C., Fr. Bryan Hehir, USSC secretary for social development and world peace, and Russell Shaw, NCCB secretary for public affairs.

Between general meetings of the Synod, a permanent secretariat, supervised by a small group of Bishops under the presidency of the Holy Father, prepares for the forthcoming meeting and maintains some kind of continuity between one Synod and the next. The Synod as such does not have a permanent existence. The functions entrusted

to it cease at the conclusion of each general assembly. The present secretary general of the permanent secretariat is the recently appointed Dutch Archbishop Jan Schotte, who was previously on the Council for Justice and Peace and is said to have helped in the preparation of the Holy Father's encyclical *Laborem Exercens*.

The Holy Father also appoints one or more special secretaries for each meeting of the general assembly. The special secretary this time will be Fr. Walter Kasper, a well-known professor of theology in the Catholic Faculty at Tuebingen, Hans Kueng's university. One of his duties will have been summarizing the answers from episcopal conferences to the list of questions sent out by the permanent secretariat earlier this year. This summary will be the starting point of the discussions.

Rallying Support

Basically there are four questions.

What steps have been taken in your country and-or diocese to make the Council known and implement its teaching and instructions?

What benefits have resulted?

What errors and abuses have there been?

What should be done now?

The questions are asked first about the implementation of the Council as a whole, then about nine specific areas of belief and practice: Scripture, Tradition, and the *Magisterium*; the Church; collegiality; the liturgical reforms; spiritual formation of priests, Religious, and youth; catechetics; the missionary spirit and evangelization; ecumenism; the role of the Church in the world. Is the faithful's understanding of these subjects better or worse than before? How far have efforts to realize the Council's teaching in regard to them been beneficial or harmful?

While the responses from episcopal conferences are certainly important, it would be naive to suppose that the Holy See has not long had more than enough information to answer all these questions for itself, or that the Holy Father's main purposes in calling the Synod is not to rally support for his efforts to stem the abuses and guide the conciliar renewal onto the right track

A Number of Blessings

What then has the Council achieved so far?

The answer many people give to this question will no doubt be determined by the kind of parish or diocese they live in.

If your parish or diocese is one where abuses abound and you consequently have difficulty in believing the Council has done much if any good, I suggest you try and get hold of the September issue of the *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter*. The Fellowship, which from the start has been notable for wisdom and balance, asked a random sample of its members to give their own answers to the Holy See's questions. The September issue gives a selection of these replies and full texts are being prepared for distribution later.

Among the benefits mentioned are: the disappearance of a Jansenist-inspired scrupulosity and preoccupation with *minutiae*; greater knowledge of and interest in Holy Scripture through the new lectionary; a better understanding of the fact that the Church truly is a community, that there is "an intimate relationship between faith and good example", that the Faith has social implications, and of the dignity of all men (the result being the diminution of an unhealthy kind of spiritual individualism); also a more truly Christian attitude towards non-Catholic Christians and members of other religions.

To this list, I think could be added a better understanding of the mystery of the Church and the fact that all are meant to strive after holiness and be apostles. The vernacular too, I believe, has been a blessing, and with good and accurate translations would have been a much greater one. Latin should of course not have been allowed to die. As a universal society the Church needs a universal language. Its abandonment is an abuse. But with most people the truth does penetrate deeper when they hear it in their own tongue.

If this seems a somewhat meager list, it does not mean the conciliar decrees are incapable of producing a more ample crop. When the Church's period of trial and purification is over, which is how I believe the current upheavals should be seen, and the Council's true meaning is more

widely understood, the fruits should be deep and lasting. They are best seen I think in Religious orders like those belonging to the *Consortium Perfectae Caritatis*, lay institutes whose spiritualities in some way anticipated the Council, and lucky parishes with exceptionally wise, orthodox, and intelligent pastors.

Modernist Anglicans

For the present, however, all this is like the first shoots of plant life in early spring, repeatedly checked by the persisting frosts and half-buried under the mass of dead matter from the autumn before. The trail of havoc caused by distortions of the conciliar teaching and abuses of the reforms can only be invisible to those, for whatever reasons, determined not to see it.

Mass departures from the priesthood and Religious life; a devastating drop in priestly and Religious vocations; the closing down of countless schools, seminaries, Religious houses, hospitals, orphanages; the abandonment of the Faith by hundreds of thousands, if not millions of the laity; two or more generations growing up in ignorance of the rudiments of the Faith; a moral and spiritual decadence in many of the surviving seminaries and Catholic colleges that would have raised eyebrows at the court of Alexander VI Borgia.

All this may apply more to Western Europe and North America than to other parts of the world. But it is not the less serious for that. Clearly in similar circumstances the managers of a secular concern would not sit back and say, "Everything is fine really. We must be optimists".

At the end of 20 years the majority of the still church-going in the prosperous West no longer believe large areas of the Church's teaching. Many may be very little to blame. Great numbers may honestly think they are doing what the Church wants. But the fact remains. In belief, they have been turned into Modernist Anglicans (a liking for dignified worship is retained but everyone believes what they please), or praying, Bible-reading Protestants or secularized "democratized" activists, or adherents of a trivialized psychologized religion of togetherness with only two doctrines "God loves you" and "Everybody is basically nice", or else a mixture of two or more of these "faiths".

Restoring Balances

Why? What has caused these problems?

This, the next of the Holy See's questions, is the most important of all, even if it is the one people are most reluctant to face squarely. Unless you can see why something is wrong, you are not going to succeed in putting it right.

Once again there is really no mystery. It is a matter of things everyone knows.

The first is the fact that some of the most influential experts responsible for drafting the Council's decrees, having already begun to lose the Faith before the Council began, had by the end of Pope Paul's reign — along with their by that time numerous converts — won the *de facto* right to preach their errors in the Church on a par with the preaching of the Faith — and frequently in preference to the Faith. How can you stem abuses if those chiefly responsible for them occupy chairs in the Church's universities and positions of power in her bureaucracies? I am not talking about men honestly wrestling with complicated and still unsettled theological problems. I mean men who deny and attack teachings of the ordinary and extraordinary *Magisterium* down the ages.

To some extent, it is true, their task has been accidentally facilitated, and the Church's complicated — a point I touched on before — by the very nature of the Council's work.

On the theological plane one of the main purposes of the Council was to restore a balance where it was felt it had been disturbed by the overstressing of certain aspects of Catholic belief at the expense of others. The Faith being, like many other things, a harmony of complementary opposites, too much emphasis on one facet easily leads to the overshadowing of the other. Hence the conciliar shifts of emphasis or "new orientations". The ideal is for both sides of each set of complementary opposites — God's mercy and justice, Christ's divinity and humanity, or whatever it may be — to receive equal attention.

In the confusion following the Council, however, it was relatively easy for Modernism to convince people that complementary opposites are antithetical or contradictory opposites — justice conflicts with mercy, liberty cannot live

with authority, hierarchy is a denial of liberty, the Mass cannot be at one and the same time a sacrifice and a "sacred meal"— and sweep aside whole areas of the Faith under the appearance of super-fidelity to the Council. "Fidelity" to the Council means speaking only of those subjects and ideas to which the Council gave new prominence, as though its decrees can exist in isolation, and every pronouncement of the *Magisterium* does not have to be understood in the context of the Church's total teaching.

This has been Modernism's most remarkable achievement. What God originally joined, it has been able to put asunder, common sense notwithstanding, and it now has only to cry "pluralism (or community or co-responsibility) in danger" for masses of by this time totally bewildered Catholics to see any attempt to discipline it as really a reversal of the Council. After all, if you have a good thing, more of it must be better. If a glass of medicine once a day is beneficial a bucketful must be a hundred times as beneficial. This frame of mind has unquestionably made things more difficult for bishops. Nevertheless much more could have been done at the national level than has been.

A Bag of Temptations

Am I calling for a witch hunt? Not at all. You can only hunt what is hidden or running away. In this case the "witches" are lolling at ease in every room in the house. It is reasonable to think they should be made to leave until they have given up "witchcraft". Indeed one doesn't see how things can improve much until authority braves the international clamor and braces itself for the task.

The second reason why things have gone awry is the mass disaffection of lay people from the Holy See because it refuses to legitimize contraception and re-marriage after divorce. Modernism would never have had the success it has had if contraception and dissoluble marriage had not been included in its bag of temptations. With these it has bought the support of millions of Catholics who would otherwise have been indifferent to its purely doctrinal heresies — ongoing revelation, ascendancy Christology, the supernatural existential or what you will. This is probably the most intractable problem of all. There will have to be

mass reconversions. With *Familiaris Consortio* and his world tours, the Holy Father has been doing what he can. But here too he will need much more wholehearted support at the local level if this situation is to be reversed.

Which brings us to the heart of the matter.

Conciliarism and Gallicanism

The third and principal reason why in so many countries the conciliar renewal has failed in its effects is the conversion or partial conversion of numbers of bishops to a Modernist Protestant understanding of the conciliar teaching. Obviously bishops who agree wholly or in part with the theological revolutionaries are not going to discipline them or make any serious attempt to reconvert their flocks to the fullness of Catholic faith and morals.

The episcopal departure from loyalty and fidelity explains the unexpected recrudescence of Conciliarism and Gallicanism, which everyone thought had been put an end to for good and all by the teaching of the First Vatican Council. Conciliarism, it will be remembered, was at its apogee in the late Middle Ages, and Gallicanism in the 17th and 18th centuries. Both were forms of Episcopalianism, more or less disguised; but where Conciliarists tried to turn the Pope into a figurehead by subjecting him to the authority of a General Council, the Gallican method was to exclude him as much as possible from the life of the national Church. Where Gallican principles reigned, no Papal message or instruction could be published or read to the faithful without permission of the government.

Signs that a revival of this kind of "Catholic Episcopalianism" was underway had already shown themselves at the Council, and during the 1960s and 1970s, in alliance with Modernism, its supporters adopted the Conciliarist approach. The Synod, as we have seen, was to be a permanent General Council under their control. But their efforts having been outwitted, they have increasingly followed a Gallican line. Modern states being non-confessional, the episcopal conference is to be the defender of the national Church against the "encroachments" of Rome. The episcopal conference rather than the Synod is for the time being to be the instrument for curtailing Papal power.

The modes of operation of this kind of neo-Gallicanism, which U.S. Catholics know as well as anybody, now range from the widespread practice of speaking well of the Holy Father as a man while ignoring what he says as Pope, to expressions and assertions betraying an underlying thought that is equally un-Catholic.

When for instance the clergymen in control of an episcopal conference wish to tsmporize, it is said that the Holy Father and the episcopal conference are "entering into dialogue". The implication is that a debate between equals, Rome and the Washington conference bureaucracy, is underway, and that the truth or right policy will emerge, Hegelian fashion, from the clash and final fusion of the two viewpoints. I myself have heard an influential member of the U.S. Hierarchy at a press conference in Rome say, in reply to a journalist who had asked what the Holy See would do were some instruction or point of doctrine not to be accepted in the United States, that since the Council, Rome would think twice before clashing with really big episcopal conference. One thought of Goliath flexing his biceps at the approach of David.

At other times sociological and existentialist criteria are invoked to justify recalcitrance. Rome is said not to be able to understand the "American experience". (People who talk this way, however, usually seem quite ready to lay down what should be done in countries remote from their own, like Chile or South Africa. Only the Pope, or "Rome", apparently suffers from an inability to comprehend anything beyond the fence of his own backyard.)

Demand for Increasing Independence

In England, up to a short time ago, these ideas were seldom given unequivocal expression at episcopal level. Three months ago, however, in their response to the Holy See's questionnaire in preparation for the Synod, the English Bishops suddenly and resoundingly abandoned their earlier reticence.

The first thing that strikes one about the English Bishops' document is that it is less an attempt to answer the Holy See's questions than a theological tract in which the

authors lecture the Holy See about the Church, pluralism, evangelization, and “ministries”.

It is also like a split-level apartment, the distinctive feature of a split-level apartment being that you are less aware of its being on two floors than in the case of a house.

The response’s immediate tactical objective (the upper floor) is Gallican. Single quotes do not give the full flavor, but here are two that are typical.

“In presenting the role of the Bishops as the visible foundations of the Church, *Lumen Gentium* states”

(*Lumen Gentium*, of course, nowhere presents the Bishops as the Church’s foundation. On the contrary it says (art. 23) that “the Successor of Peter is the perpetual and visible source and foundation of unity both of the Bishops and the whole company of the faithful”.)

The second quotation carries us from theory to practice.

“Diocesan bishops and bishops’ conferences should be able to exercise without hinderance their true responsibility for the well-being of the life of the Church in their territory”.

Who or what is hindering them?

There are many passages like this, all conveying the impression that any failures in the implementation of the Council are due to bishops having been unlawfully deprived of powers which rightfully belong to them, and that if the renewal is to be completed they must be free to settle matters of doctrine and discipline locally.

More power for local episcopates to alter doctrine as they think fit — with the tacit consent of Rome — is, then, the document’s first objective.

“*The Church from Below*”

If, however, the immediate aim is Gallican (and how else would the document have gotten episcopal support?), the underlying ecclesiology (the lower floor, and this is clearly what the authors really care about) is Modernist. The Church whose outlines emerge through the mist of abstractions, cliches, and ambiguities is Modernism’s now familiar democratic congregationalist, religious-experience-based “Church from below”. The Church does not take its origin from the Apostles. It begins with quasi-autonomous local

communities which on their own gradually coalesce into larger and larger groupings. "The diocese", say the authors, "may be seen therefore as a drawing together of such local groups or congregations". After that comes the national Church, and so it goes on until a universal Church emerges. (It is a bit like the human race beginning with a mass of emerging hominids instead of with Adam and Eve.) This being so "each level of the Church needs the capacity to exercise sufficient responsibility for its life and ordering so as to develop its integrity as a community within the wider communion".

(But a parish, diocese, or "regional church" does not have the kind of isolated "wholeness" suggested by the word *integrity*. Its members are under the bishop and Pope simultaneously, the authority of the latter penetrating directly and immediately — not via an episcopal conference or any other intermediate body — to every part.)

Opposing this teaching of the First and Second Vatican Councils, the authors of the English response also imply that the Pope may only exercise his infallible teaching office when individual bishops or provincial councils are "unable to deal with divisions in matters of faith satisfactorily in their own right". And to make sure that the bishops don't get above themselves either, there is heavy insistence on their office being a service. "The vital element in the exercise . . . of episcopal and Papal authority", the authors go on, "is that it enables the lower levels of the Church to . . . develop in life and mission as true expressions of the Church of Christ". (No trespassing on the "integrity" of the parish, thank you.)

The subsection entitled "The Priestly Office" is entirely about the laity.

One-Sided Emphasis

It is this conception of the Church that Modernism will undoubtedly be trying to get accepted as widely as possible at their 1987 Synod on the Laity. Modernism's support for increased episcopal power is only a temporary tactical expedient.

The authors' "pluralism" is just as little Catholic as their ecclesiology. The Church has always found a place for

diverse spiritualities and theological approaches. But what varies is their method of presentation and differences of emphasis in secondary matters, not their substance. The "pluralism" of the English response on the other hand is liberal-Modernism pluralism — contradictory propositions can both be true. "In Roman theology contraception is unlawful. In English theology it is sometimes allowable. Both positions are expressions of the one Faith". (The last is not a quotation from the English response, only my characterization of the authors' way of thinking.)

Co-responsibility (meaning everyone being equally responsible for everything), pluralism, and the concept of the People of God are the three ideas on which the authors' ring the changes in order to drive their message home. The English response, in other words, perfectly exemplifies what I said happens when the complementarity of Christian beliefs is ignored (willfully or otherwise), and the points stressed by the Council are emphasized one-sidedly.

Heavy Ammunition

Perhaps the most curious part of the business is our English Bishops' failure to see that Modernism is as ruinous of episcopal authority as of Papal authority. Ultimately it has no more use for bishops than had the 17th century English Puritans who pressured Charles I into chopping off the Anglican Archbishop Laud's head. (Even if Laud wasn't a bishop, the Puritans thought he was one.) To gain not only an unworthy advantage but a short term one, they have surrendered themselves to their worst enemies.

If there is one thing Church history demonstrates above all others it is that the authority of the Pope is the surest guarantee of true episcopal authority and freedom. Bishops who turn against Peter almost invariably end up captives of the state, their clergy, their flocks, public opinion, or their own ideas.

This I think is probably the true meaning of the famous French adage *Qui mange pape en meurt* — "he who tries to devour the Pope dies of it". The French ought to know. They have had a long historical experience of rulers who tried to make a meal of Peter's Successor.

Published in early August, translated and circulated in pamphlet form in France by *Temoinage Chretien*, with a sympathetic preface by the writer Georges Montaron recognizing and approving its Gallican and Modernist implications — the English Bishops' response, according to the Catholic bimonthly *L'Homme Nouveau*, instantly became heavy ammunition in a widespread and well-organised print, press, and media campaign against the Pope, Cardinal Ratzinger, Rome, and the forthcoming Synod.

The Opening Salvo

If I have given rather a lot of space to the English Bishops' response, it is not without reason.

At the 1980 Synod on the Family, an alliance of U.S., French, and English delegates led the opposition to the Holy See, with the Americans firing the first shot.

This time the opening salvo, one deeply regrets having to say, has been launched on behalf of England.

What line has the United States been committed to?

Compared to the English response, that of the U.S. Hierarchy is a much more immediately presentable document; better written, better organized, more discreet, temperate, and dignified. More effort is made to answer Rome's questions, and there is a greater willingness to admit seriously damaging facts — the drop in converts, for instance, from 4.3 per 1,000 active Catholics in 1950 to 1.8 per 1,000 today.

There are also some good suggestions for improving things. Homilies should have more moral and doctrinal content; there should be "urgent efforts" to restore the Sacrament of Penance; the distinctiveness of the priestly role should get more emphasis; religious education should be "guided by the normative character of the Church's teaching"—"it should not focus simply on a catechism of change" (ought it to focus on it at all?). One only wonders what has prevented these remedies being applied at any time in the last 20 years.

The chief defects of a general kind are: the downplaying of the extent of the post-conciliar decadence (there are some classic understatements — "false ideas about ecumenism . . . seem to have influenced some Catholics"); and the

refusal to face squarely the real causes of that decadence (in two places the major part of the blame is laid on "cultural factors outside the Church"). One thinks of a possible letter from Neville Chamberlain to Winston Churchill at the time of the Munich crisis explaining that nothing really bad was going on in Germany.

About specific matters, directly questionable statements are on the whole avoided, though the implications of remarks about the importance of "addressing issues such as clerical celibacy", and advancing women "to positions of leadership and decision-making" leave one wondering. (Can a woman really be said to "lead" a parish or diocese short of wearing a chasuble or carrying a crosier?) And what does the sentence mean: "The Church stands in need of a new philosophical and conceptual framework — perhaps, also, a new symbolic and affective system"? Only representations of the Resurrection permitted? A ban on crucifixes?

"Shared Responsibility"

All this, however, is small beer. If there were nothing worse one would almost feel thankful. Unfortunately (or is it in fact fortunately?) there is one passage as bad as anything in the English response which, once read, casts everything else in a different light. Because of its importance—it is subtitled "Collegiality and Shared Responsibility"—I quote it in full.

"Much of the ecclesiological confusion concerning collegiality and shared responsibility now visible focuses on three institutions: the Roman Curia, the Synod of Bishops, and the episcopal conferences. That the Synod may in some sense be viewed as an instrument of collegiality few doubt, but how it should play that role is disputed. Similarly, there are conflicting views of the episcopal conference, ranging from the idea that it is merely a 'service agency' to the view that it has a clear collegial and magisterial character. The appropriate relationship of the Curia to the bishops both individually and collectively, is similarly a matter on which conflicting opinions now exist.

"To some extent, this state of ecclesiological confusion can be traced back to Vatican II. The treatment of collegiality in Chapter III of *Lumen Gentium*, important as it

it, nevertheless contains ambiguities and raises unresolved questions which have become increasingly acute with the passing of time. That, however, is not an argument for premature attempts to answer questions; it would be better to recognize that a certain built-in tension now exists in this area of the Church's life, to accept the fact that various views can and do legitimately exist, and to pursue a serene dialogue without supposing that any party now possesses the final answer".

Everyone knows that documents of this sort are drafted by committees. But it must have had some kind of episcopal supervision and endorsement. How could two such outrageously mendacious paragraphs, in direct conflict with *Lumen Gentium*, conceivably have passed episcopal scrutiny unnoticed ?

Ignoring the Overall Meaning

The one truth in them is that Chapter III of *Lumen Gentium* contains ambiguities. In this respect, contrary to what the authors assert elsewhere, some of the problems now besetting the Church did come "from the Council", and it is interesting to see it admitted. There would have been fewer problems if the majority of the Fathers at the Council had been more vigilant, making sure that every hole in the fabric of the conciliar teaching made by the heterodox experts was properly filled. But in the case of *Lumen Gentium's* Chapter III the holes were stopped up. Every possibility of doubt or confusion about the relationship of Pope to bishops and vice-versa, whether acting as a college or not, was removed by the famous Preliminary Explanatory Note (*nota praevia*) which, it will be remembered, was added to the final text of *Lumen Gentium* on the instructions of Pope Paul shortly before it was voted on.

Actually, I have never myself found *Lumen Gentium's* Chapter III particularly ambiguous. Only by ignoring the overall meaning and taking isolated sentences out of context can you extract a Conciliarist or Episcopalian sense from it. But the Holy See had evidence that that was what certain experts intended, and the *nota praevia* was designed to forestall them.

Why then does the passage I have quoted not mention the *nota praevia* ? And why is there no reference to the

sections of the new Code of Canon Law which remove the possibility of any honest confusion about the Curia (360-361), the Synod (342-348), and episcopal conferences (447-459) — the instruments through which the relationship between the college and its head find concrete expression? Why too are the authors so anxious that the doubts they artificially raise should not be put at rest? What reason is there for tension or dialogue when, about the essential points, the “final answers” have been given? The Curia is an instrument of the Supreme Pastor, the Synod is a consultative assembly, and as a legal body the episcopal conference is a convenience deriving its right to exist and act entirely from the Holy See. These facts may be disputed. But so today are facts like the Resurrection, the Real Presence, and the goodness of purity.

Little Help from the U.S.

It was to counter just these kinds of obfuscation of the meaning of collegiality and episcopal conferences that the Holy Father gave an important talk on its true meaning to the Swiss Bishops in the summer of 1984, in which he drew special attention to the *nota praevia* (3).

Altogether this passage from the U.S. Bishops' response suggests two things: that the authors and their friends fear a Papal statement of some kind defining yet more strictly just what an episcopal conference is and is not, theologically and jurisdictionally; and secondly that in any contest at the Synod over collegiality and the status of episcopal conferences, the Holy See is not going to get much help from the United States.

(In saying this, I realize that in every country there are bishops who do not share the views of the dominant majority of their brethren in the Episcopate, but through the power of the conferences find it hard to resist unlawful or heterodox initiatives. I do not underrate the strength of the pressures brought against them, or the false positions in which they are often placed against their will.)

Unquestionably many other subjects will be aired in the Synod hall; those listed in the Holy See's questionnaire, and others, like women's ordination, which are not. But I believe the meaning of collegiality and the status of the episcopal conference will be the central issues, whether or

not they get most public attention. I agree with *L'Homme Nouveau's* distinguished editor Marcel Clement. What is under assault is not just one doctrine among others, but the very foundations of the Church.

Suitable Bishops

How is the Church to deal with a situation like this ?

Eminent figures like Cardinal Ratzinger, Cardinal de Lubac and Fr. von Balthasar have already suggested that a first step is to reinforce the authority of the individual bishop. The individual bishop needs to be freed from the excessive power of the conferences, just as the bishops collectively need to be freed from the excessive power of their conference bureaucrats.

The other remedy, one respectfully suggests, is for the Holy See to examine more carefully the channels through which it receives advice about the kind of priests who will make suitable bishops.

Choices for important Sees in America, France, Holland, and Ireland over the last two or three years indicate that this need has been recognized. But the message conveyed by a recent appointment in England is that unsound advice is still being given.

Given the exalted nature of the bishop's office, these things are naturally difficult for a Catholic to say. But is it not possible that if they had been said earlier, or more often, or by more people, it would not now have been necessary to call an Extraordinary Synod ? Apart from helping Modernism, what has been achieved by the pretence that the implementation of the Council has been going along satisfactorily, except for some troublemaking by a few old-fashioned stick-in-the-muds on "the right". Has it avoided scandalizing the simpler faithful? I doubt it. Those who still believe are not a little scandalized already, while of those apparently not scandalized, many are being drawn further and further from the fullness of belief.

The Right Balance

What concrete results will the Synod have ?

At the risk of rapidly looking silly, I suggest that the consultative nature of the Synod makes it extremely unlikely that there will be any sudden or dramatic bettering of

things. So too does the extent of the decadence and false teaching. There are no means by which a situation like the present one can be instantly put right. Even if, as the *National Catholic Reporter's* columnist Peter Hebblethwaite fears, the Holy Father were to persuade the Synod Fathers to agree to a dogmatic definition about contraception, it is unlikely, short of an unprecedented rain of grace, that everyone opposed to *Humanae Vitae* is going to fall on their knees and cry *mea culpa*. As I said earlier, the Synod should be seen as an additional step in a continuing campaign.

Is what the Holy Father has been attempting a "restoration", that word dreaded by Modernism?

If restoration means a return to the *status quo ante*, the answer is obviously No, nor I think would any Catholic with a modicum of understanding of the Council want it. What John Paul II is trying to bring about—after getting the theological money-changers to alter their minds or quit the Temple, is the right balance between things "new" and "old", the *nova et vetera* of the Gospels, which our Lord tells us the wise householder (whom we can here identify with the Church), knows how to bring out of his storehouse. Due to the over-preoccupation of the orthodox members of the reform party at the Council with things "new" (readers will appreciate that they were not meant to be "new" in the sense of supplanting anything true), and the determination of the heterodox members that the "new" *should* supplant the true, the conciliar teaching failed to achieve that balance. As the Holy Father said recently, the conciliar principles or orientations having been drawn up by human beings, they "can be imperfect and remain open to ever more precise formulations" (4). A vast amount of what can be classified under the heading *vetera*, and should have remained firmly in place, has consequently been swept aside. Insofar as it has to be brought back, the Holy Father's campaign to implement the Council properly does therefore involve a "restoration".

Pray Mightily

Two final points.

In this article I have mostly been talking about the human side of that divine-human reality, the government of

our Lord's Mystical Body. But I don't want the supernatural side to fall out of sight. The assistance the members of the *Magisterium* receive from the Holy Spirit, whether gathered in a deliberative assembly like a General Council, or a consultative one like the Synod, is not like the assistance received by the inspired authors of the Bible. It can be resisted. All the same it must necessarily be very great.

The second point is that the Synod is not only the occasion for an exchange of views between the Holy See and representatives of the rest of the College. It is also an occasion when the bishops exchange views and get to know each other. Some will already have made up their minds about the meaning of collegiality, one way or the other. But others may not have. They will be listening, watching, reflecting. We should therefore pray mightily that the hearts and minds of any who have been hesitating or confused about this vital subject will be moved in the right direction; also that in regard to the other subjects dealt with by the Council they will have the grace to form an accurate judgment of how well or poorly they have been implemented in different parts of the world up to now.

(To be continued)

HOW IT IS DONE

Our Diocesan Ordo

Gives

February 10th

As "WHITE: MEMORIAL:
ST. SCHOLASTICA":

Yet

On February 11th.

The feast of

Our Lady of Lourdes

(Extended to the

Universal Church

By Pope St. Pius X),

We have:

"GREEN: FERIA. Or

WHITE: OPTIONAL MEMORIAL:

OUR LADY OF LOURDES.

R. S.

Old Grey-Haired Errors

1: "NEW" THEOLOGY

FR. THOMAS O'MAHONY

"What was will be again; which has been done will be done again; and there is nothing new under the sun. Take anything of which it may be said, 'look, now, this is new'. Already, long before our time, it existed". Ecclesiastes 1: 9-11.

THOUGH most older Catholics are by now aware that professional theologians in positions of influence have propagated many errors, most, we feel sure, are now aware that this so-called "new theology" foisted on them is nothing more than a rehash of the "old grey haired errors", which the Magisterium in the past has singled out for specific mention and condemnation. For that reason it is necessary to keep pointing out these errors as they arise, lest the faithful be led astray by their apparent newness dressed up in a show of scholarship.

"Old Grey-Haired Errors"

Here, for example, are some errors published and condemned by the Holy See. On December 8th, 1864 Pope Pius IX condemned the following propositions: 1. "Divine revelation is incomplete and, therefore, is subject to a continual and indefinite development in order to correspond to the progress of human reason". 2. "Protestantism is simply another form of the same true Christian religion, and it is possible to please God just as much in it as in the Catholic Church".

In 1907 St. Pius X condemned the following: 1. "The teaching church and the learning church so work together in defining truths, that the only function of the teaching church is to ratify the generally held opinions of the learning church"; 2. "It was far from the mind of Christ to establish a Church as a society that would last on earth for a long succession of centuries"; 3. "The organic constitu-

tion of the Church is not unchangeable; rather, the Christian society is just as subject to perpetual evolution as human society is"; 4. "Dogmas, sacraments, hierarchy—both their notion and their reality—are nothing but evolutions and interpretations of Christian thought which caused the tiny seed, hidden in the gospel, to grow through external accretions and brought it to fruition"; 5. "The Roman Church became the head of all churches, not because of any determination on the part of divine providence, but because of political conditions".

Descendants of Gnostics and Modernists

Bearing these errors of the early Gnostics and their descendents, the Modernists, in mind, let us reflect on a few of the statements made by their present-day descendants. A shocking example was given in an article written in 1983 by Fr. Michael Amaladoss, former head of formation of the Indian Jesuits. While he had tried for many years to bring a knowledge of Christ to the Hindu, he is now content, he said, to "dialogue with my Hindu brothers, looking forward to a mutual enrichment and collaboration in the building up of a new humanity". He no longer works and prays for "a time when the whole world will be Christian"; and now maintains that evangelization is concerned with "socio-economic and human development". Consequently, he concludes, all religions are "faith commitments leading to the same goal". "I am open to the possibility", he added, "that the Church is called to die too, that the world may live. This is true of all religions". (cf. *Christian Order*, May 1985, p. 312).

It would be foolish to pass this off as an individual's descent into the "Valley of Despond" because this is a fashionable view today among neo-Modernists, as well as among their logical offspring the liberation theologians, as exemplified in the case of Franciscan Fr. Boff who was recently silenced by the Holy See.

The Case of Father Boff

Boff, a Brazilian Franciscan tried to justify his erroneous, in fact, heretical, views in a book entitled *Church: Charism and Power*. It is replete with errors concerning the struc-

ture, dogma, exercise of power and the prophetic role of the Church. The Holy See condemned it and the Vatican Curial Cardinal, Josef Ratzinger, stated on March 20, 1985 that in Boff's view "the Church as an institution was not in the thoughts of the historical Jesus but evolved after the Resurrection". Consequently, the hierarchy was not divinely instituted but resulted only from the need to institutionalize the Church; the true Church, therefore can exist apart from the Catholic Church, dogma is time-bound and so has value only for a determined time and circumstance.

The Case of Father McBrien

Another influential writer holding similar views is Fr. Richard McBrien, Chairman of the Theology Department at Notre Dame University. In 1980, McBrien published a two-volume opus of 1186 pages plus Appendix and Glossary entitled *Catholicism*. It received devastating criticism and, even though the author went to Australia to promote his brand of Catholicism as well as sales, the bishops there did not take kindly to his invasion of their jurisdictions and published a severe warning with regard to the book. "*Catholicism* by an American Catholic priest, Fr. Richard McBrien", they wrote, "has been receiving much publicity. We, the Catholic bishops of Australia, feel obliged to issue a statement on it. On the one hand, the book has been praised as a masterly summary of Catholic teaching; on the other, it has been criticized for deviating from authentic Catholic teaching. In particular, it has been suggested that the book is an excellent medium for use in Catholic schools. We disagree. *Catholicism* has some strong features, but it also has real weaknesses. For example, it puts side by side two things which cannot be equated; the Church's authentic teaching and the opinions of theologians — some of them quite radical ones. The result can easily be confusion about what the Church really teaches".

Besides holding the error that theologians of "scholarly competence" are part of the official Magisterium of the Church, Fr. Richard McBrien's scriptural knowledge is limited solely to the highly unorthodox views of the form and reduction critics, as well as to the historical method

of Bultman, which Raymond Brown follows. For example, he holds that Jesus suffered from ignorance and error; that the gospels were not written by eye-witnesses but are the product of the later Christian communities, who fabricated miraculous events as a method of communicating their faith in Christ as a divine person; that the virginal conception is dubious; that men are not "composite beings made of body and soul" because it is not a Hebrew view of man but a product of Greek philosophy (this error in the Dutch Catechism was condemned by the Holy See in 1968); and that it is wrong to hold that the Catholic Church is the one true church as non-Catholic churches are also part of the true church.

McBrien, however, did find some congenial company in the Southern Continent. Dr. John Thornbull, a well-known Sydney theologian, in a front page article of the *Catholic Weekly* criticised the "Penny Catechism", which had been reprinted and circulated. This catechism, he wrote, "is at variance with the spirit of Vatican II and even with elements of the teachings of Vatican II". Why? Because it states: "True Christians are to be found only in the true church and the true church is the church united under the one visible head appointed by Christ".

Father Avery Dulles, S.J.

Fr. Avery Dulles, S.J., in a talk before the interdenominational American Theology Society, uttered a similar view: "Roman Catholics no longer require belief that all bishops originally received orders by direct apostolic succession from the Apostles", and so, he concluded, "Christ's Church on earth is not identical with the Roman Catholic Church — it embraces all Christian churches, Catholic as well as Protestant".

Father Gerald O'Collins, S.J.

Another neo-modernist, Fr. Gerald O'Collins, S.J. in his booklet *The Case Against Dogma* takes issue against dogma as such. "For the future", he says, "one can only hope that the church as a whole will agree to dispense with dogma . . . Ultimately, I can only conclude that 'dogma' must be dropped because it is a bewitchment of our

intelligence rather than an outrage against our Christian lives" (pp. 99-100).

Father John Quigley, O.F.M.

Here is another example of these tried old errors. In 1950 Fr John Quigley, O.F.M., put the following ridiculous piece on tape for those poor mentally dull Catholics, who were not competent to read between the lines of Vatican II, "One of the things that happened at the Vatican Council that I don't think most people understood", he said, "is that the Catholic Community stood up and defined itself as being part of the Church of Christ — that the Church or Body of Christ is this big, let's say — and they said that the Catholic part of the Body is at the center — where you'll find all the teaching; you'll find everything within the fullness of Christ's Body within the Catholic Community. But the Catholic Church is NOT THE CHURCH — the whole church and nothing but the church. The Church of Jesus Christ is much bigger than the Catholic Community. We believe the Catholic Community is at the center of the church, and that there are many other Christians in good standing and in good fellowship who are all part of the Body of Christ — even though we differ on certain issues with them — that the church is much larger than the Catholic Church. O.K.?"

Quite obviously it is not "O.K."? It is heretical.

One final example, Alan Schreck, Associate Professor of Theology at the Franciscan University of Steubenville, in his book, *Catholic and Christian* wrote: "As for the nature of the church, the (2nd Vatican) Council stated that the one church of Jesus 'subsists in' the Catholic Church, and that 'many elements of sanctification and of truth can be found outside of her visible structure' (Dogmatic Constitution of the Church, N. 8). The phrase 'subsists in' which means 'is rooted in' or 'dwells within but is not limited to' was carefully chosen. It means that the one true Church of Jesus Christ is found within the Catholic Church but is not limited to it. The bishops purposely did *not* say that the Church of Jesus Christ is the Catholic Church".

Surprisingly the Charismatics Publication *New Covenant* reprinted this heretical piece with approval. (For a schol-

arly article on the significance of "subsists in" see the *Homiletic & Pastoral Review*, January 1984, pp. 10-21.

In these days of open dissent from the Vicar of Christ, it is a sad thought not surprisingly to discover that the official representatives of the sons of St. Francis, Friars Minor, assembled in Assisi for the General Chapter in June of this year, saw fit to ignore the strongly stated requests of the Holy Father.

Pope John Paul to the Friar's Minor

Well aware, as he is, of the doctrinal errors disseminated by many friars, and disturbed by their continued support of the so-called "liberation theology" and involvement in social and even political concerns to the detriment of their religious identity, the Holy Father sent a warm five-page letter to the chapter officials in which he wrote that "Christians expect you to love the Church as St. Francis loved it", and called on them "to observe the Rule of St. Francis approved and interpreted by the Church".

Becoming more specific, he said: "I exhort you, therefore, to an attentive review of the theories and practices which have proved to be an impediment to the answer to such expectations, and to put into effect whatever can be of help to the complete fulfilment of the duties inherent in your particular form of life. More than ever will it be beneficial to serve the Lord in that poverty which St. Francis wished to be the particular character of his order . . . This 'highest poverty' cannot be limited to proclamations in defence of the poor, even though evangelically and socially right and proper. It receives fullness of religious significance only if it is poverty really lived. Besides, when it is effectively put into practice, poverty requires that the fruits produced from it remain at least partially hidden, becoming in this way both humility and wisdom. It induces one to live a life of silence rather than of propaganda, and avoids boasting about oneself and of being self-satisfied".

The Pope reminded the Friars that they were not "a 'movement' open to new options continually replacing others, in the ceaseless search for a proper identity, as if it had not already been found".

It is stated often enough that Christians have not done very well at producing a just society. Would they have done even worse if Marx hadn't come along to jog their elbows? In this second part of his article, Mr. Santamaria takes up this issue and considers some of the social reforms actually introduced in the last two centuries. Acknowledgements to *Social Survey*.

A Catholic Debt to Marxism? : 2

B. A. SANTAMARIA

THE article "The Marx of the Church" twice adverts to the alleged Marxist "challenge" to Christianity (or Catholicism)—that Christians' deeds fall far short of their moral protestations—without seeming to understand how threadbare this ploy really is when it issues from Marxist lips. "... Theology" writes Fr. Kelly, "never was the only issue. That resides in our way of life, the effort to live one's truth in practice. Marx would probably put it like this. 'Show me the world you are forming, and I will tell you what you really believe in.'" He further writes of Marx, "asking with that rather ferocious gaze, 'What does your salvation mean? Who really profits? What vested interests do you serve?'" and so on.

Breast-Beating

If Marx really asked that question of Christianity, rather than the statement being merely one more example of Christian breast-beating at the all-too-obvious failure of Christianity in the field of public policy, it would be merely another example of the fraudulent dialectical methods used by Marxists to impose their own assumptions on those Christians whose knowledge of history is, to say the least, defective.

Reinhold Niebuhr, the eminent Protestant philosopher and theologian, had a clear understanding of this perennial Marxist tactic. Marxism, he wrote, "has the advantage of satisfying a deep instinct in the human heart. It places blame for an unfortunate situation entirely upon others".(15)

Christianity was the dominant influence in European civilization, with the capacity to create and sustain its political and social structures, only from about A.D. 800 to A.D. 1400. Before A.D. 800 and the crowning of Charlemagne as Holy Roman Emperor, Europe was broken up into a series of competing, largely pagan fiefdoms, as a result of the disintegration of the Western Empire. From A.D. 1400 onwards, Christianity was simply routed by the forces of the Renaissance, the Reformation and the French Revolution. In the other continents, Christianity had no influence whatsoever on their respective social structures during that period in which it enjoyed a dominant influence in Europe.

The Test

Christians do not have to believe that Christianity made a stunning success of the European world in the period in which it was actually the dominant influence — we have much of which to be ashamed — to point out that Marx ought to be the last person to advance that particular argument: that Christian practice ought to be the test of Christian theory.

After all, Marx's children have controlled the Soviet Union for just on 70 years, Eastern Europe and China for just on 40. One may leave aside the familiar figures of 30m. to 40m. who perished in the Soviet Union during the collectivization and the purges; the 100m. whom the present Chinese leadership itself claims to have suffered seriously during the Cultural Revolution (leaving aside the millions who lost their lives in the takeover of power in China and in the Great Leap Forward); the 2m. to 4m. who perished in the Cambodian genocide. The more telling question, behind these excesses of now-fashionable revolutionism, is what was it all for? The question with which Marx allegedly challenges Christianity faces the Marxists themselves: "Who *really* profits? What vested interests do *you* serve?"

The answer was given long ago by Djilas in *The New Class*, the central thesis of which has been complemented by Konrad and Szelenyi in their *The Intellectuals on the Road to Class Power*. Of their own knowledge, both Djilas and the later Hungarian authors state that Marxism simply represents, and merely reflects, the interests of the managerial and bureaucratic "new class", which controls the economic power and a considerable part of the political power in Western capitalist democracies, but *all* power—economic, educational, political, and to some extent even spiritual—in communist countries.

Privileges

Helene Carrere d'Encausse documents the steps whereby *in Lenin's own time*, four social groups successfully guaranteed for themselves *and their children* exclusive access to social and educational privileges denied to the mass of the Soviet population: the technical specialists, the political leadership, the army (and the K.G.B.), and the "creative intelligentsia". Behind the fiction of modest wages to maintain the myth of social equality came the reality of special rations (early 1920s), housing privileges (January 16, 1922, 1924), travel, and prizes of significant amounts of money rewarding creative activities (1925).

"There was thus created in a few short years, on the margin of the workers' society, a society of the favoured, who sometimes displayed their privileges and sometimes, as in the case of those with political responsibilities, concealed them behind the fiction of modest wages. Whether it was admitted or not, social differentiation had all the more weight because it was linked to a possible perpetuation of these differences through the opportunities for access to higher education." (16)

This was soon to be largely confined to the children of the privileged classes.

Dozens of readily-accessible works document this salient feature of all Marxist societies. Three of the most recent come from the pens of authors who have themselves enjoyed those privileges *U.S.S.R.*; *The Corrupt Society* by Kontstantin M. Simis (Simon & Shuster, New York, 1982); *Nomenklatura Anatomy of the Soviet Ruling Class* by

Michael Volsensky (The Bodley Head, 1984); and Andreï Schevchenko's *Breaking with Moscow* (Knopf, New York).

An Earthly Paradise

The slick answer to this argument is to adopt Chesterton's aphorism concerning Christianity, and to state that Marxism, like Christianity, has not so much failed as never been tried. It is not a defence which Marxists permit Christians to make for their particular beliefs. To be fair to Christianity, it never claimed to be a political movement which could transform this "vale of tears" into an earthly paradise. Its rewards were to be found exclusively in eternity. Marxism claims that this post-terrestrial paradise is an alibi for failure, if not for corruption, "the opium of the people". While seeking to rip the facade off the credentials of Christianity, Marxism never tackles the pathetic fallacy of its own.

HAS MARXISM BEEN A CATALYST ?

Despite what has been written, it is open to argument that even Marxist philosophy as a theoretical structure is self-contradictory; even if it is accepted that its practical results have been the abominations of State-imposed totalitarian ideologies, it has nevertheless been an evil permitted by God in order to awaken Christianity to its responsibilities to the oppressed. Has it, accidentally and unwittingly, as it were, been permitted to serve as a catalyst forcing Christianity to face the challenge of social justice ? That is a question which must be submitted to the judgement, not of philosophy, but of history.

It is difficult to state what history actually proves in relation to any issue. It is much easier to state what it does not prove, what the historical evidence does not support.

What has actually happened over the century and a half since the Marxist theses were first propagated to the world?

Slavery

The abolition of slavery in the British colonies, perhaps the greatest social reform accomplished in the 19th century, was not due to any Marxist impulse either upon British public policy or upon Christianity, or upon any other spiritual or intellectual force operative within the British

community. It was due to Wilberforce and the stimulus of his Evangelical faith. Wilberforce fought for the abolition of slavery from the moment he entered Parliament in 1780—a decade before the French Revolution and 68 years before the publication of the *Communist Manifesto*—until 1830, when it was achieved. The official Marxist orthodoxy in relation to the abolition of slavery came to be the theory that slavery was abolished by the propertied classes because it had become an inefficient method of production. The Marxist argument, being neither proveable nor disproveable, is therefore one whose proponents cannot lose. In any case, it was not Marx but Wilberforce who applied the *coup de grace* to slavery.

The first attacks on the British upper class Establishment came not from Marx, but from the great English novelists of the middle of the last century—particularly Dickens, Thackeray and Eliot.

The Industrial Revolution

The first onslaughts on the appalling excesses of the Industrial Revolution were made long before Marx and Engels first clearly set forth their views in the *Communist Manifesto* in 1848, and long before the first volume of *Das Kapital* appeared in 1867. The first Factory Act limiting the hours of labour and regulating the working conditions of paper-apprentice children was passed in 1802, 46 years before the publication of the *Communist Manifesto*. Others followed in 1819, 1831 and 1833, the latter of which provided mechanisms for inspection and enforcement. These were followed by a whole series of Mines Acts, and the supplementary Factory Acts in 1844 and 1847. They seem primitive enough in contemporary terms, but they show that the first responses to the horrors of the Industrial Revolution were present long before Marxism developed any coherent theory. They prove conclusively that the beginnings of the program designed to abate the worst evils of the Industrial Revolution in Britain—the country in which both its beneficial and harmful effects were first felt—were put into effect long before Marx's allegedly scientific analysis of capitalism. The great figure in the history of the British Factory Acts was not Marx (although he was resident in London), but Shaftesbury.

The first impulses to specifically Catholic social reform owed nothing whatsoever to any Marxist challenge. From the middle of the 19th century, at the same time as the various socialist parties were developing, a powerful and pervasive movement under the generic title "Christian Democracy" spread over the greater part of Europe, based essentially on the personalist, pluralist and regionalist principles associated with Catholic social thinking.

Practical Attitudes

Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* was issued on May 15, 1891. Marxism had no influence either on its contents or timing. In fact, at the time, Marxism was not the most important of the various Socialist movements themselves. As J. Newman points out, (17) "there is considerable evidence that Leo's approach was . . . affected by the practical attitudes towards labour and agrarian problems of Cardinal James Gibbons in the U.S. and Henry Edward Manning in England", as well as by the preaching, teaching and organizing of Bishop von Ketteler in Germany from 1848 on, and by the Freiburg Union established in 1885 by Cardinal Mermillod. Its general doctrine apart, what was significant about it was that "its appearance marked the bestowal of significant papal approval on the then emergent Catholic social movement".

Christian Democracy

The Catholic social movement, known by the generic title "Christian democracy" was far from "emergent" by the time Leo XIII published his encyclical. A full fourteen years had passed since, on March 17, 1877, in the Reichstag, the German Centre Party moved its celebrated resolution on social reform, "the first effort at social reform by *any* party". (18) It was, in fact, only the decision of the Catholic Centre under the leadership of Bismarck's opponent, Windthorst, then numerically stronger than the Social Democrats, to provide a quorum for the latter's resolutions which incorporated the Social Democrats into the parliamentary life of Germany.

Professor Michael Fogarty has described the historical process which witnessed the expansion of Christian Democracy, the chronology of whose development makts it clear

that a characteristic Catholic reaction to the social problem had no roots in any response to any hypothetical Marxist challenge. (19) Christian Democracy was universally and strongly anti-Marxist.

The strongest evidence of the moral and political power of this authentically Catholic movement was the role of the greatest figures in the reconstruction of Europe after the holocaust of World War II. These were the two Christian Democrat statesmen, Konrad Adenauer in Germany (who had been imprisoned by Hitler), and Alcide de Gasperi in Italy (a political refugee from Mussolini given employment in the Vatican Library). To some partial extent, de Gaulle in France belonged to the same tradition.

These three Christian statesmen rebuilt continental Europe after the total destruction of World War II.

No Marxist leader anywhere has achieved a fraction of what was accomplished by these three great Catholic leaders, animated to various degrees by Catholic social and political philosophies, for the welfare of hundreds of millions of human beings.

That this is no longer recognized, nor even adverted to, is a tribute to the inadequate and often perverse standards of learning which underline much modern history teaching.

Ireland and England

Christian Democracy did not take root in Anglo-Saxon countries, although the Irish Parliamentary Party from the time of Parnell onwards arose from similar social roots. The same Christian impulse expressed itself, however, in different ways. In Britain, a "Christian Socialism", advocating co-operatives and profit-sharing, had developed under the aegis of the Anglican, F. D. Maurice. While English Catholics, after long centuries of denial of elementary civil rights, which precluded any participation in the political and social life of Britain, and embroiled in the bitter controversies which followed the re-establishment of the English Hierarchy in September 1850, were not as advanced as Anglicans in this regard, the process was begun even in Catholic circles at the same time as Marx published his *Manifesto*.

In 1864, Cardinal Wiseman, defending his choice of Westminster for the title of his archiepiscopal see, wrote :

"Close under the Abbey of Westminster there lie concealed labyrinths of lanes and courts, and alleys and slums, nests of ignorance, vice, depravity, and crime, as well as of squalor, wretchedness and disease; whose atmosphere is typhus, whose ventilation is cholera; in which swarms a huge and almost countless population, in great measure, nominally, at least, Catholic; haunts of filth, which no sewage committee can reach — dark corners, which no lighting board can brighten . . . This is the part of Westminster which alone I covet."(20)

His understanding of his vocation is clearly identical with that of the 17th century St. Vincent de Paul and has the same Christian inspiration.

Australia

In Australia, the Church's identification with the various aspects of the fight for the protection of the interests of the working class (Marx's "proletariat") was not difficult to establish since the Church itself was founded on a predominantly Irish working class population. Hence its inspiration was not that of European Christian Democracy, but rather of the Irish-English tradition of which Manning had become the spokesman during the British dock strike of 1889, the settlement of which was popularly known as "the Cardinal's peace".

From this same impulse, there sprang Cardinal Moran's defence of the Australian maritime workers during the maritime strike of 1890 and, later, of the growing identification of Catholics with the newly-formed Labor Party. Moran was far from being an original thinker in socio-economic matters. His few attempts to apply the social principles of the Church to the mundane issues of Australian social life were singularly unimpressive. His support of the gradual affiliation of Catholicism with Labor may well have been an example of a leader following rather than leading, his people. But the objective results of his policy were the same as if he had actually led.

Conscription

Archbishop Mannix's emergence as the tribune of the Labor Movement during the anti-Conscription campaigns of 1916-17 derived from the same roots. It was not the

Marxists who led the Australian "proletariat" in this period. Mannix's inveterate opponent, Dr. Alex Leeper, Warden of Trinity College, Melbourne, was to write of him that "no man in the Commonwealth commands equal influence with the proletariat". (21) From the same source came the series of Social Justice Statements of the early forties and fifties, publicly praised by Pius XII himself.

It is extraordinary that this almost unique history of involvement in the cause of the Australian working class seems to be quite unknown in the Catholic Church in this country, although none of it is more than a hundred years old. In all of that history, there is not a trace of Marxist influence. Nor are any of these expressions of the Church's principles a "response" to a call to conscience made, however unwittingly, by Marx.

THE SEALED TRAIN

It is, of course, conjectural : but I would go as far as to say that if the German General Staff had not conveyed Lenin on a sealed train into Russia, so that his Bolsheviks could serve the German interest by the program of "revolutionary defeatism", which issued in the Bolshevik *coup d'etat*; if the German and U.S. capitalist corporations had thereupon not financed the Russian Bolsheviks, consolidating the Soviet State, providing the material resources for later expansion into other countries. Marx today would not be better known than sociologists broadly contemporary with him, like Max Weber, Emile Durkheim, Vilfredo Pareto and Joseph Schumpeter.

My final essay in scepticism relates to Fr. Kelly's statement :

"In the meantime, the world goes on and the church goes on. Judging by the events we witness today in the Philippines, in Poland, in South America and dozens of other places, Marx would be very surprised at what he has unwittingly inspired Christians to do. He seems to have been something like a catalyst for a 'Second Reformation' in the Church."

Poland ? Is it really Marx who has inspired the Catholics of Poland — whose ancestors resisted tyranny long before Marx was born—to resist, in their turn, Poland's tyrannical Government ?

The Philippines ? There is no doubt that there has been considerable Marxist penetration of Catholic structures, and that a number of religious, men and women, co-operate with the communist New People's Army. During his recent visit to Australia, Bishop Fortich of the Philippines admitted that the fact of communist penetration of Catholic structures, particularly social action bureaucracies, was undeniable. But Bishops Fortich and Claver, whose dedication to social reform and opposition to the undoubted evils of the Marcos regime cannot be doubted, firmly reject the Marxist option, for the obvious reason that it represents, at best, long decades of brutal internecine warfare; and, at worst, as the example of neighbouring Vietnam and Cambodia proves, the exchange of a far worse tyranny for that which presently prevails. Bishop Fortich made it clear that if the only choice were to turn out to be between the Marcos regime, (which he attacked) and the communist N.P.A., Marcos was preferable. His view is shared by other members of the Philippine hierarchy, clergy and religious.

Refusal

South America ? Apart from the hotly-debated issue of Nicaragua, I can only note that there have recently been democratic elections in Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay and Peru. No Marxist has even remotely come near election to the Presidency in these countries. In relation to the first three, I do not know if one has even stood. In Pinochet's Chile, the opposition to the President, including the Christian Democrats, will not enter into an alliance with either the communists or the Miristas. In El Salvador, whether or not Duarte can ultimately solve that country's appalling problems, the people have obviously chosen Duarte's Christian Democrats and not the revolutionaries with smoking guns in their hands, even if the latter have been commended by a number of religious, whose zeal eclipses their knowledge. Is the Salvadoran people's opposition to the Marxists inspired by Marx ? Have the people reacted as they have precisely and only because Marx's ideas present in their world awakened them to the evil of oppression and shamed them into acting against it ? Would they have failed to recognize the evil of tyranny if Marx had never lived ? It would seem unduly rash to assert this !

CHRISTIAN IDEAS

Undoubtedly, there is deeply embedded in Catholicism, a long tradition of Christian Democracy to which apart from the invaluable contribution of the U.S. in the Marshall Plan, the post-war salvation of Western Europe is almost exclusively owed. Why then do we not draw from the inspiration of what is both Christian in origin and relatively successful in practice? Why Marxism, in defiance of all the evidence—historical, political, economic, religious?

The only reasons I can give for this extraordinary phenomenon is, on the one hand, the influence of a certain intellectual fashion and, on the other, the deadening influence of the increasing ignorance of history, including Catholic history, over the last four or five decades.

Intellectual Fashion

In the first instance, the intellectual fashion began in a combination of euphoria and impatience among some younger men and women in Europe soon after World War II. They wanted Europe to be rebuilt on a new pattern, one that would omit a lot of the old structures of privilege, and a lot of the old injustices. But they also wanted this to be done quickly and not according to the tried, steady, prudent methods of Adenauer and his like. Some of them were impressed by the new German school of political theology and the possibility of using it to mobilize Christians for political re-form. (22) Others turned to Marx because they had been impressed by the Russian contribution to the defeat of Hitler's Germany, or because they had known Marxists during the war, particularly in the Resistance, and had been given by them an idealistic version of Marxist ideology: it was presented as the quick and scientific way to the exact analysis of society and to the establishment of social democracy — or Marxism with a modern and human face.

If those who had been influenced by political theology or Marxism were university lecturers or schoolteachers, clerical or lay, they promulgated the new gospels to their students. The students, in their turn, would take the message further afield—to the Philippines, to South America and to many other countries, particularly to those where there was urgent need of social reform.

In Europe, of course, and generally in countries with good communications, many of the new Marxists became disillusioned by the revelations of Stalin's iniquities and by the events of the Hungarian and Czechoslovakian revolutions, and they retreated from Marxism as well as from cooperation with communist Marxists. However, the return to reality was not universal amongst intellectuals in the free world, particularly in some of the developing countries — e.g., in Latin America, where political theologians and Marxists tended to pool their resources, and where Castro's victory in Cuba made a deep impact. The local Marxists portrayed themselves as the "change agents" of a new and just society, and the myth that Marxism is a useful scientific method for the analysis and reform of the social order continued and continues to be passed on to large numbers of young people.

The Schools

In the world's schools, while the direct impact of various types of Marxists has been felt, another damaging element has been the disappearance of history as a serious and sustained discipline. This is true of Catholic schools as well as of others, and one important result has been that young Catholics are growing up with little knowledge of the actual historical processes of social change, of the historical development of Catholic social teaching. In other words, the Catholics have followed along the arid trail pioneered by "progressive" educationists in the public sector. It is surely there that the work of restoration must begin.

REPRESENTATIVE OF A NEW ORTHODOXY

My reason for attempting to analyse the reasoning of *The Marx of the Church* is that it is representative of a new orthodoxy finding its way into Catholic schools as a result of which the idea has developed widely that cooperation with communists in efforts to achieve a just society presents no dangers and is perfectly normal, permissible and likely to be fruitful. Teachers fondly assert that the quest for peace is a moral issue and that the methods proposed by the Marxist Left for the achievement of their "peace" are equally moral in their purpose and beyond

discussion. Parents and children who question the new orthodoxy are not infrequently morally isolated.

Progress?

The result is that the policy of the "open hand" of Communist collaboration, repudiated by every Pope during the last hundred years, is widely propagated within the Catholic educational system. As a result, Australian Catholic history in the last quarter of the twentieth century seems to register a progression—if not a progress—from participation in St. Patrick's Day marches to participation in largely pro-Soviet "peace" demonstrations.

If it is true that Marx has made a distinctive contribution to Catholic social consciousness, it ought to be possible to demonstrate that he has. If the philosophical and historical evidence refutes the proposition, it is both wrong and damaging to teach it to priests or laity.

NOTES

15. R. Niebuhr, quoted by A. McAdam, *Melbourne Herald*.
16. Helene Carrere d'Encausse, *Confiscated Power: How Soviet Russia Really Works* (Harper & Row, New York, 1980), p. 24.
17. J. Newman, *Catholic Encyclopaedia* (McGraw Hill, New York, 1966), p. 24.
18. M. L. Anderson *Windthorst: A Political Biography* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1981), p. 210.
19. M. P. Fogarty, *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. III, pp. 653 ff.
20. Edward Norman, *The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1974), p. 155.
21. Dr. Alex Leeper, *The Speculator* (London), March 23, 1918.
22. James V. Schall, S. J., *Liberation Theology*, Ignatius, San Francisco, 1982, p. 57 ff.

The Editor regrets that, owing to acute shortage of space, book reviews have had to be held over until next month.

"The Chesterton Review is keeping alive what has become a fugitive tradition of social criticism."

— Joseph Sobran, *The National Review* (New York).



A Special Issue of The Chesterton Review

Charles Dickens. November 1985 issue deals with Chesterton's work as a Dickens critic. Contributors include Sylvère Monod, President of Dickens Fellowship, and Merja M. Makinen, Dickens House Scholar in 1983.

Other Special Issues

FATHER BROWN includes an uncollected Chesterton detective story.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY. Noel O'Donoghue writes on Chesterton in Ireland.

CHRISTOPHER DAWSON. Edited by Dawson's daughter, the author of the new Dawson biography.

GEORGE GRANT special issue. Critics discuss George Grant, Canada's leading social philosopher.

SPECIAL BONUS

With each new subscription you receive
a free copy of one of the special issues.

Please send this order form with payment to
THE CHESTERTON REVIEW, 1437 College Drive,
Saskatoon, Sask., Canada S7N 0W6

Subscription cost \$16.00 per year
or \$8.00 per special issue.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

Bonus Special Issues
(Check one)

- ☐ Christopher Dawson
- ☐ Father Brown
- ☐ George Grant
- ☐ Charles Dickens
- ☐ 10th Anniversary

CHRISTIAN AFFIRMATION CAMPAIGN

APRIL CONFERENCE

High Leigh Conference Centre, Hoddesdon, Herts.

from

Tea-time on Monday, April 7th to lunch-time on
Thursday, 10th.

Cost for 3 days, including all meals, is £40. Bring your own
soap and towel.

Way there is by Green Line coaches 735 and 798 to Hod-
desdon. British Rail from Liverpool Street to Broxbourne.
Private cars — Hoddesdon is on Cambridge Road just
North of London, marked on any map.

Rev. Arthur Lewis will speak on the situation in Zimbabwe
and South Africa.

Ray Honeyford, recently retired Bradford Head Teacher,
will speak on his recent experiences.

Ian Thompson, formerly a leading figure in the C of E
Prayer Book Society, recently received into the
Greek Orthodox Church, will speak of his disil-
lusionment with the Church of England.

Celia Davies, an Anglican from the Responsible Society,
will speak of "The Pressures of an Immoral Society
on Young People".

Other speakers : Carlos Anunez, Patrick Lamport and the
Ravid David Scott.

Enquiries to :

Bernard Smith, 30 Clifton Road, Worthing, West Sussex.